

for a pension under existing laws. These 631,000 new pensioners must be earning a minimum of \$3,000 a year already and they will get, not just a portion of the \$102.37 as their needier brothers would get, but the entire \$102.37 a month.

So, from among the 631,000 proposed new pensioners, the very minimum case would be someone who now has \$3,001 a year in income. This veteran of World War I would receive an extra \$1,200 a year from H.R. 3745, bringing his income up to \$4,201 a year, not counting what he may be receiving from social security, from his union pension fund, from his company's pension fund, from railroad retirement or from whatever other pension income he may be getting. I might add that \$4,201, or the minimum income accruing to each new pensioner embraced by this absurd bill, is more than \$200 a year higher than the income level of 84 percent of the male population of 65 years of age or older.

And, if this bill were passed, who would be paying for it? The taxpayer, of course. Where do the taxes come from. Eighty-one and nine-tenths percent of all income taxes come from individuals and almost half of all the people in the United States paying income taxes reported an adjusted gross income of less than \$4,000.

If we were to approve of H.R. 3745 we would find ourselves in a morally indefensible position. And, frankly, the position would be politically indefensible as well. We would have to explain to our constituents why we voted for legislation which would force half the taxpayers of the United States to contribute to the support of those who are already making more money than they are.

Of course, I have been talking about minimum income allowable under H.R. 3745. The maximum income allowable under the bill would be \$3,600 for a World War I veteran with dependents. The extra \$1,200 a year would boost this man's income to \$4,800 a year, plus whatever pensions and annuities he might be receiving from any source whatsoever.

We will routinely have cases where the veteran has \$5,000 to \$6,000 and gets \$1,200 a year in pensions. As we all know, this income could be considerable. It is not rare in these days to find our senior citizens getting pensions or annuities from two or more sources. No matter what the size of these pensions, these people would still be eligible for the extra handout.

Let me cite an example close to home. Under certain circumstances, if a Member of this House were to retire he would receive, under our own pension plan, an annuity which the average citizen would consider not only adequate, but handsome. But if such a retired Member were also a veteran of World War I, even if he had only 3 months' service, he could collect this \$102.37 a month pension, just as long as he managed to keep his income from fees, rentals, dividends and other sources under \$3,600 a year. If this was a problem, he could shift some of it to his wife. I suggest that this is not the purpose for which any other pension plan conceived by the mind of man was ever intended.

Let me repeat, Mr. Speaker, this startling fact about H.R. 3745. Under its provision, all World War I veterans, over 65 and who are receiving less than \$3,000 a year in wages, and now on the pension rolls would receive very little help. All those receiving more than \$3,000, but less than \$3,600, would receive the entire \$102.37 extra a month and, of course, would not be required to count social security or other retirement payments. Under this weird reasoning, the less you are receiving now, the less you will get; the more you are receiving now, the more you will get. In other words—"them that has, gets."

The Veterans' Administration estimates that in fiscal year 1963 the present pension program will cost the taxpayers \$1,783,681,000, of which 78 percent or \$1,386,489,000 will go to World War I veterans, their widows and children. If H.R. 3745 were enacted, almost \$1 billion additional would be imposed on our pension bill.

The Internal Revenue statistics for the tax year 1959—the latest figures available for this purpose—show that there were approximately 21½ million individual returns filed showing a gross income of less than \$3,000. The revenue from this group amounted to \$1,665,759,000. This is \$118 million less than will be required to operate the pension program we already have and it is \$1 billion, 18 million less than it would take to pay for the pension program we would have if H.R. 3745 were passed and enacted into law.

H.R. 3745 is grossly unfair and discriminatory as between veterans. I think there are none who would deny that the service-connected veteran and surviving widow and children of service-connected veterans deserve first consideration. If a veteran is totally and permanently disabled from a service-connected cause he only receives \$2,700 a year. If he is 50 percent disabled, he receives \$100 a month. A widow who lost a husband in the war gets about \$87 a month. An orphan child who lost a father in the war and subsequently lost a mother gets \$70 a month. Two dependent parents living together, who lost a son in the war, get \$75 a month if their combined income is not over \$2,400 per year. Yet, we are being told that the present income limit of \$3,000 for the married, non-service-connected veterans, who served 90 days, is too low and that we must raise these income limits.

We have been trying since early last year to get a modest service-connected increase bill through the Congress. This bill would cost less than \$100 million, yet we have not been able to get it through. Now an effort is being made to get a \$1 billion non-service-connected pension bill passed which would give better treatment to the 90-day, non-service-connected soldier than the seriously disabled service-connected veteran receives. Mr. Speaker, this is grossly unfair and I do not see how this Congress could possibly accept such a proposal, regardless of the amount of political pressure that is applied.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 26, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, as for this quiet moment we look away from our mundane tasks to Thee, strip us of our illusions, create in us clean hearts, O God, and renew a right spirit within us.

In our hearts as we come is the grateful remembrance that Thy patience outlasts all our dullness of apprehension and all our stupid choices. In spite of the worst things in us, which we despise, Thou knowest that in our highest hours our deepest desire is to be true servants of Thy will in these troublous times, giv-

ing our best ability to the welfare of Thy children everywhere. May we rise above all bitterness by an unshakable belief in the shining splendor of humanity.

Gird us to stand in an evil day with principles never compromised and with integrity never sullied.

We ask it in the name of Him who is the way, the truth, and the life. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, June 25, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills of

the Senate, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 2164. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the First World Conference on National Parks, and for other purposes;

S. 3161. An act to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes; and

S. 3203. An act to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 8738. An act to amend sections 1 and 5b of chapter V of the Life Insurance Act for the District of Columbia;

H.R. 9441. An act to exempt life insurance companies from the act of February 4, 1913, regulating loaning of money on securities in the District of Columbia; and

H.R. 9954. An act to amend the act of June 6, 1924, chapter 270 (43 Stat. 463), relating to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, as amended by the National Capital Planning Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 781; 40 U.S.C. 71).

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 860. An act to provide greater protection against the introduction and dissemination of diseases of livestock and poultry, and for other purposes;

S. 1834. An act to further amend the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 896), as amended, by providing for an increase in the authorization funds to be granted for the construction of hospital facilities in the District of Columbia; by extending the time in which grants may be made; and for other purposes;

S. 3063. An act to incorporate the Metropolitan Police Relief Association of the District of Columbia;

S. 3266. An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled "an act to create a Library of Congress Trust Fund Board, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1925, as amended (2 U.S.C. 158), relating to deposits with the Treasurer of the United States of gifts and bequests to the Library of Congress and to raise the statutory limitation provided for in that section;

S. 3291. An act to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury;

S. 3350. An act to amend the act of August 7, 1946, relating to the District of Columbia hospital center to extend the time during which appropriations may be made for the purposes of that act;

H.R. 3444. An act to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior adjusting, deferring, and canceling certain irrigation charges against non-Indian-owned lands under the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7723. An act to amend section 303(a) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 by increasing per diem rates and to provide reimbursement under certain circumstances for actual expenses incident to travel;

H.R. 10459. An act to provide for the conveyance of 39 acres of Minnesota Chippewa tribal land on the Fond du Lac Indian Reservation to the SS. Mary and Joseph Church, Sawyer, Minn.;

H.R. 11057. An act to declare that the United States holds certain lands on the Eastern Cherokee Reservation in trust for the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians of North Carolina;

H.R. 11743. An act to amend the provisions of title III of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; and

S.J. Res. 192. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H.R. 8738. An act to amend sections 1 and 5b of chapter V of the Life Insurance Act for the District of Columbia;

H.R. 9441. An act to exempt life insurance companies from the act of February 4, 1913,

regulating loaning of money on securities in the District of Columbia; and

H.R. 9954. An act to amend the act of June 6, 1924, chapter 270 (43 Stat. 463), relating to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, as amended by the National Capital Planning Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 781; 40 U.S.C. 71).

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, of the Government Operations Committee; the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, of the Judiciary Committee, and the Subcommittee on Public Health of the Committee on the District of Columbia were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Finance was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

RESOLUTION OF KANSAS STATE BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the Bar Association of the State of Kansas at its recent annual meeting at Topeka, Kans., urged their congress to remove monetary limitations upon the jurisdiction of the district courts in civil actions against the United States.

I request unanimous consent to have the pertinent resolution printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Whereas 28 U.S.C. 1346(a)(2) (popularly known as the Tucker Act) limits the jurisdiction of the U.S. district courts in contract actions against the United States to claims of \$10,000 and less, notwithstanding other grants of unlimited jurisdiction to such courts in tax refund and tort claim actions against the United States; and

Whereas this jurisdictional limitation is burdensome to lawyers and litigants in that it requires larger claims to be tried in the Court of Claims in Washington, D.C., rather than in the forum of the claimant's residence or in the forum where the contract may have been executed; and

Whereas a specialized tribunal has not been found to be necessary or desirable to determine Government liability in noncontract actions or in contract actions involving claims of \$10,000 or less; and

Whereas recent enlargements in the Federal judiciary should permit these claims to

be tried expeditiously in district courts if claimants could elect to bring them in such courts rather than in the Court of Claims: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Bar Association of the State of Kansas at its annual meeting at Topeka, Kans., on May 10, 11, 12, 1962—

1. That the executive council memorialize the Congress of the United States to remove all monetary limitations upon the jurisdiction of the district courts in civil actions against the United States; and

2. That copies of this resolution be sent to Senators Frank Carlson and James B. Pearson; Representatives William Avery, Floyd Breeding, Robert Dole, Robert Ellsworth, Walter McVey, and Garner Shriver; Attorney General Robert Kennedy; and to the Honorable Alfred P. Murrah, chief judge, 10th Circuit Court of Appeals.

Passed unanimously by the general assembly of the Bar Association of the State of Kansas in its annual meeting on May 14, 1962, at Topeka, Kans.

HARRY O. JANICKE,
President.
JOHN W. SHUART,
Executive Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ENGLE, from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments:

S. 1108. A bill authorizing the conveyance of certain property in the city of San Diego to the regents of the University of California (Rept. No. 1630).

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment:

H.R. 12154. An act to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended (Rept. No. 1631).

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

A bill and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 3474. A bill for the relief of Cathie Lee Clark; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON (for Mr. STENNIS):

S.J. Res. 204. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit the use of prayer in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. ROBERTSON when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT AND EXTENSION OF SUGAR ACT OF 1948—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I send to the desk two amendments to H.R. 12154, which is the sugar bill, or act, to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

These amendments will not both be adopted, since they appear at the same point in the bill. They are different means of achieving my purpose in offering the amendments, which is to protect the American consumer in the matter of the price of sugar.

I ask that the amendments to the bill be printed and lie on the desk, notwithstanding the fact that the bill itself will be reported to the Senate only tonight.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the desk.

**PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORTS
ON J. PERCY PRIEST RESERVOIR,
STONES RIVER, TENN. (S. DOC.
NO. 102)**

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], chairman of the Committee of Public Works, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated April 17, 1962, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of the reports on the J. Percy Priest Reservoir, Stones River, Tenn., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, adopted February 20, 1960. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CANADIAN FINANCIAL CRISIS

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Canadian Lesson," which appears today in the New York Times. I wish to call particular attention to the concluding paragraph of the editorial, which, for emphasis, I should like to read:

This does not mean that the Canadian crisis does not have its lessons for us. But there is no need to panic and cut back on programs vital to growth. Foreign confidence must be maintained; but this is best done by demonstrating that the American economy is competitive and increased efficiency depends on expansion. Our problem is not a question of living beyond our means but of insuring that we utilize all the resources in men and machinery that are now lying idle.

Mr. President, I am particularly struck with the cogency and pertinence of the concluding paragraph, because we have among us a few nervous individuals who feel that the sole solution to the economic problems before the country is to cut back upon programs which, in my opinion, are vital to the welfare of the country.

I agree with the thought expressed in the concluding sentence, that—

Our problem is not a question of living beyond our means but of insuring that we utilize all the resources in men and machinery—

And materials, facilities, and resources—that are now lying idle.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, June 26, 1962]

THE CANADIAN LESSON

Canada's financial crisis is being pictured as an omen of what the United States faces if we do not get our own house in order.

The weakness of the Canadian dollar does illustrate the grave risks a nation runs when

it persists in living beyond its means. The Government has been pursuing an easy-money policy to stimulate domestic activity which has helped to increase imports, bringing about a deficit in Canada's balance of payments. But in recent years foreign demand for Canadian resources, principally mining and agricultural products, has dropped along with foreign investment in Canada. The amount of the payments deficit has thus increased.

Canada's Government has had ample warning that it was headed for trouble. But with an election in the offing, Prime Minister Diefenbaker was reluctant to lose votes by taking politically unpalatable measures. The electorate, however, did not give Mr. Diefenbaker a majority vote of confidence. And now, to defend the dollar, he has been forced to take a series of drastic belt-tightening steps. The Bank of Canada has raised its discount rate to 6 percent, which may help to attract foreign capital. New tariffs have been levied on foreign goods. Imports will be cut. Government spending will be reduced by \$250 million. And the Government has obtained over \$1 million in loans and standby credits from the International Monetary Fund, the United States and the British Governments.

These are harsh and humiliating measures that became inevitable after the earlier reluctance to take any action. And their severity reveals the depth to which the Canadian dollar, which once sold at a 5-percent premium over the U.S. dollar, has fallen. But they also are proof that Canada is determined to bring about a restoration of foreign confidence in its currency.

The U.S. dollar is itself under suspicion, and many are leaping to the conclusion that it will suffer the same fate as the Canadian dollar. But our position differs in many fundamental respects. Canada has been running a huge trade deficit which, until recently has been covered by an inflow of foreign capital investments; in contrast, the United States has a healthy surplus in its trade account. The Canadian budget is relatively much bigger than our deficit; and we have not experienced the continuing rise in prices that, through monetary inflation, has beset Canada. Finally, our currency reserves are much greater, and our economy much more resilient because it does not depend primarily on world demand for raw materials.

This does not mean that the Canadian crisis does not have its lessons for us. But there is no need to panic and cut back on programs vital to growth. Foreign confidence must be maintained; but this is best done by demonstrating that the American economy is competitive and increased efficiency depends on expansion. Our problem is not a question of living beyond our means but of insuring that we utilize all the resources in men and machinery that are now lying idle.

**AMA TO STUDY TOBACCO AND
DISEASE**

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am deeply gratified to be able to announce that the board of trustees of the American Medical Association has directed its council on drugs to study and report upon the relationship between tobacco and disease. The board's action is of the utmost significance in view of the eminence of the council on drugs in the fields of pharmacology and therapeutics.

The board's decision could not have been lightly made. The evidence of tobacco's effect upon the Nation's health has been shrouded in acrimonious con-

troversy, provoked in large measure by the ubiquitous tobacco industry. It would have been far simpler for the board to have declined to embroil the association in this controversy. They did not decline. For this, they are entitled to our profound respect and gratitude.

I am confident that the medical evidence thus far publicized will be reviewed dispassionately and objectively by the council, and I await with keen interest the issuance of their report.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter from Dr. Ernest B. Howard, assistant executive vice president of the American Medical Association, informing me of the board's decision, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., June 9, 1962.

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER,
U.S. Senate, Special Committee on Aging,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: The Board of Trustees of the American Medical Association considered your inquiry regarding the official position of the American Medical Association on the subject of smoking and health. I am happy to report to you that the board instructed the Council on Drugs of the AMA to study and report on the relationship of tobacco and disease. I shall keep you apprised of the progress of the council in its study of this important subject.

May I take this opportunity to congratulate you on the impetus you have given, both to the American Medical Association and the Public Health Service, on this important matter.

Sincerely,

ERNEST B. HOWARD, M.D.

CONSTRUCTION AT CERTAIN MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives in regard to House bill 11131, authorizing certain construction at military installations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11131) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. RUSSELL. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. JACKSON, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. BEALL, and Mr. GOLDWATER conferees on the part of the Senate.

FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, has suggested that Walt W.

Rostow, counselor of the State Department and Chairman of its important Policy Planning Council, be called before an appropriate committee to explain, as its reported author, a highly controversial foreign policy document which has been making the rounds at top levels within the administration, and here on the Hill. The document is 286 pages long, reportedly, and it is titled "Basic National Security Policy," as an outline of the administration's grand strategy for the conduct of foreign affairs for the coming years.

The Senator from Illinois has eloquently spoken here of Mr. Rostow's assumptions that the Soviet Union's policies are mellowing, and are even on the verge of becoming honorable, and asserts there is little or no intelligence support for the theories advanced in this new policy document, prepared for President Kennedy and the National Security Council. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] has similarly spoken, terming the theme of this foreign policy guide hazardous in the extreme, and worthy of the Senate's closest scrutiny and examination.

Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with these conclusions, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD articles by Willard Edwards appearing in the Chicago Tribune on June 19, titled "Asks Senate To Question Rostow Plan," and on June 21, titled "Rostow Policy Plan Riddled by GOLDWATER," and editorials appearing in the Dallas News, in my home State, on June 20, titled "Mr. Rostow to the Stand," and on June 21, titled "The World Is Flat."

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, June 10, 1962]
ASKS SENATE TO QUESTION ROSTOW PLAN
 (By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, June 18.—Senate questioning of Walt W. Rostow, State Department planner of a foreign policy guide for the Kennedy administration, was suggested today by Senator DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, the minority leader.

DIRKSEN told the Senate that an appropriate committee should require Rostow to supply the intelligence data on which he bases an assumption that the Soviet Union's policies are "mellowing."

Intelligence agencies assert there is little or no evidence to support Rostow's theories, DIRKSEN noted.

READS TWO STORIES

"If this basic assumption is only opinion, I would suggest it is not proper ground on which to stake the entire future of the American people," he remarked. "I think a great deal more will be said on this Senate floor about this subject when the Senate has examined it in detail."

DIRKSEN placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two Chicago Tribune articles published yesterday and today which presented a digest of a foreign policy draft under preparation for more than a year and now ready for official inspection of President Kennedy and the National Security Council.

TOP FOREIGN ADVISER

This document, under supervision of Rostow, the President's top foreign policy adviser during the Presidential campaign and now Chairman of the State Department Policy Planning Board, proposes a conciliatory approach to the Soviet Union, based

upon the doctrine that "evolution" of the Communist state will soon permit meaningful agreements between the Communist and non-Communist worlds.

Senator HUGH SCOTT, Republican, of Pennsylvania, agreed with DIRKSEN that exposure of the Rostow draft's contents would arouse much floor discussion. He asked if there were not some "strong" thinkers in the Government to oppose the "fuzzy minded." DIRKSEN said many in the Pentagon remained of the opinion that a "tough line" should be followed in the cold war with Russia.

AWAITED WITH TREPIDATION

"Many of us, not unfamiliar with Mr. Rostow's thinking, have awaited the birth of this new strategy with considerable trepidation," DIRKSEN said. "Mr. Rostow has never been a very devoted disciple of the tough policy line toward Russia. It now develops that he holds some unique ideas about the Soviet Union that are considerably closer to the fuzzy thinking of the late and lamented 'Liberal Papers' than even the most liberal member of this body would be willing to accept."

The "Liberal Papers" were a collection of essays compiled some years ago by a group of so-called liberal Democrats in Congress.

SEES NO VICTORY

"The core of Mr. Rostow's proposal is that if we are only nice to the Soviets, they will drop all their suspicions of the free world and peace will finally bloom," DIRKSEN said. "His most amazing thesis is this: That both the United States and Russia are losing power and authority and that an area of 'overlapping interests' is developing between them."

"Mr. Rostow sees no victory by the United States over the Soviet Union, no victory by capitalism over communism. In fact, Mr. Rostow is a man of little hope and the last person in my opinion who should have been chosen for the all-important task of directing the continuing review of our foreign policy."

"The basic philosophy of successful conflict is always to pursue a winning course and always change a losing game. Every high school coach, every big league manager knows this. But apparently our State Department planners do not."

ANSWER IS OBVIOUS

"If Mr. Rostow's assumption, that the Soviet Union is softening is correct, then what caused it to mellow? To me the answer is obvious. The only times we have ever gotten anywhere with the Soviet Union—the only times it has ever mellowed—has been when the United States was tough. Logic would say that Mr. Rostow is recommending a course exactly diametric to American interests."

"How does Mr. Rostow explain the recent Russia breaking of the moratorium on nuclear testing, its recent announcement that they are now going to test a 100-megaton bomb in retaliation for our resumption of testing?"

"Does the presence of our Armed Forces in Thailand or Vietnam indicate the Communists are mellowing? I think the Senate is entitled to know."

[From the Chicago Tribune, June 21, 1962]
ROSTOW POLICY PLAN RIDDLED BY GOLDWATER—
FRAUGHT WITH GREAT DANGER, SENATOR
SAYS

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, June 20.—Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, told the Senate today that the United States would be launched on a new, hazardous and futile course if future foreign policy is based upon the assumption that Russian policy is mellowing.

This assumption, reported as the theme of a foreign policy guide prepared for Presi-

dent Kennedy by Walt W. Rostow, Chairman of the State Department Policy Planning Council, is fraught with great danger, GOLDWATER said.

He joined Senator DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, the minority leader, in a demand that Rostow be questioned by a Senate committee "at the earliest possible time."

Chairman J. W. FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, to whom DIRKSEN's request was forwarded, was unavailable but other committee members guessed that Rostow would be called. He has said he will be glad to testify in a full and frank discussion of his document.

"We have long heard unofficial reports about this new strategy paper being prepared by Mr. Rostow," GOLDWATER said. "As I understand it, the document was prepared as a guide for future decisions by the President and the National Security Council."

"If this is the case, it undoubtedly must be regarded as an extremely important policy device and worthy of the Senate's closest attention. If it presages historic changes in American foreign policy, we should be told about it immediately."

MOST DANGEROUS DOCUMENT

"From what we know of the Rostow paper based on the unofficial but seemingly authoritative accounts appearing in the Chicago Tribune of June 17 and 18, it is based on a ridiculously false assumption that Russia is maturing in a fashion that would lend itself to honorable dealing with the United States."

"Apparently, through the medium of one paper, based largely on Mr. Rostow's hopes rather than the hard realities of the situation, the State Department would have the President and the National Security Council adopt a new, hazardous, and patently futile course in the cold war."

"As a policy device, the Rostow paper sounds to me like the most dangerous document in America."

MORE FUZZY THINKING

GOLDWATER said the Rostow line of reasoning resembled the "fuzzy-minded" thinking in the "Liberal Papers," a collection of essays by so-called liberal Democrats in the House, which was published recently.

"The idea seems to be that changes have taken place in the capital of world communism since [Russian Premier] Khrushchev took over and that we can make use of these changes through a calculated policy of appeasement and soft speaking. This dangerous concept rests on the assumption that now—all of a sudden—the Communists are interested in reducing world tensions and may be willing to follow us in a series of unilateral acts designed to this end."

GOLDWATER said this was "the worst kind of liberal wishful thinking * * * alien to the thinking of Congress and the American people." He noted that Rostow conceded the new strategy would require a selling campaign to adjust the thinking of Americans to "this bold new approach."

PART OF BRAINWASHING

"Here we have another example of the administration's constant preoccupation with the idea that Congress and the American people don't know what is best for them or the country," he remarked. "It is part and parcel with the idea that American people must be brainwashed into changing their views for their own good."

"The American people may not have the same level of 'sophistication' that the New Frontier insists upon but they do know that Russia is not mellowing and that Communists cannot be trusted. They know that appeasement in the present world crisis is of one piece with a policy of surrender."

GOLDWATER placed in the record material published in 1957 about Rostow, then a professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Center for International Studies, and his brother, Eugene V. Rostow, dean of the Law School at Yale University, who has been mentioned as a potential nominee for a Supreme Court appointment.

[From the Dallas Morning News, June 20, 1962]

MR. ROSTOW TO THE STAND

Ever since somebody—we think it was Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina—first charged that the State Department was advocating a no-win policy, various congressional committees and individual Members of Congress have been trying to unearth the basic elements of policy which guide the State Department in foreign affairs. Most of these attempts have met with limited success.

Now Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, has suggested that Walt W. Rostow be called to the stand to testify. Mr. Rostow is counselor of the State Department and Chairman of its all-important Policy Planning Council. If anyone can explain State's policy, he should be able to do it; Mr. Rostow, along with the President himself, has been a chief architect of that policy—whatever it might be.

The reason for Senator DIRKSEN's proposal that Congress call Rostow to the stand is that the State Department counselor is reported to be the author of a highly controversial document which has been making the rounds lately at the top levels of the administration. This document—286 pages long and entitled "Basic National Security Policy"—is said to be an outline of the administration's grand strategy for the conduct of foreign affairs over the next few years.

Three months ago the News reported the existence of this document. At that time all that was known of its contents was that it advocated the elimination of first-strike weapons in the U.S. arsenal.

For the past 3 months, the administration has refused to release the document—even to congressional committees which normally have access to such information. But in the past week several highly placed officials at the State Department and Pentagon who are displeased with the contents of the Rostow report have leaked its basic outlines to the press.

According to these reports and to the public revelation by Senator DIRKSEN, the core of Rostow's proposal is an assumption that the Communists are mellowing and will give us peace if we are nice to them. Specifically, the policy statement is supposed to include these startling recommendations:

Recognition of Red China by the United States and withdrawal of U.S. opposition to Peking's admission to the United Nations.

De facto recognition of East Germany as a separate nation.

Pulling back armed opposition to the Communists along the borders of the Soviet empire.

Coercion of Nationalist China to give up the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu.

Unilateral deemphasis of nuclear weapons and reliance primarily on conventional weapons and forces.

Attempt to contain the spread of communism but do nothing to stir up trouble behind its borders.

These are not simply suggestions for change in the administration's foreign policy. Many of them have been put into effect already at least in part. Moreover, the mere fact that they are being considered should have far-reaching impact on our allies and enemies alike.

Mr. Rostow's influence on the administration cannot be doubted. It is said that he

was responsible for the administration's opposition to the B-70 and Nike-Zeus programs, that he authored the proposal to appease the Communists in Berlin, that he had an important part in drafting the U.S. disarmament scheme which would have turned our arms over to a United Nations Peace Force.

Mr. Rostow should explain. The American people have a right to know exactly what the State Department is trying to do and who is responsible for its doings. And if they don't like what they find, the American people have a right to demand some changes.

[From the Dallas Morning News, June 21, 1962]

THE WORLD IS FLAT

On this page yesterday, the News made a brief analysis of the foreign policy proposals reportedly submitted to the President by State Department Counselor Walt W. Rostow in a secret 286-page report entitled "Basic National Security Policy." Since some believe that this report is an outline of the Kennedy administration's grand strategy for the conduct of foreign affairs, and since Mr. Rostow now occupies a position of great importance within the administration as Chief of the State Department's Policy Planning Council, we believe the Rostow report merits further editorial comment.

Willard Edwards, veteran Washington correspondent for the Chicago Tribune, has provided a detailed analysis of the proposals from which we have drawn most of the following information.

In addition to recommendations that we recognize Red China and East Germany, pull back our opposition to communism along the Soviet borders, force Nationalist China to give up its offshore islands, deemphasize nuclear weapons unilaterally, and limit our opposition to communism to a general policy of containment (all of which were mentioned in yesterday's editorial), the following recommendations have also been made in the report, according to Edwards:

Our treatment of Soviet satellite nations should be gentle—we should refrain from criticizing them, continue to give them aid, open up trade channels with them and encourage our Western European allies to be more cooperative.

In no event should we ever encourage or support armed uprisings against the Communists in the satellite nations.

If we can't come to an agreement with the Soviets over arms control or disarmament, we might advance a program which does not require negotiations.

American interests will be better served by leaning toward nations with modern ideas rather than sticking to old allies with outmoded ideas. The United States does not want allies; it wants only neutrals.

Foreign aid can be used as a weapon, but only against allies (with outmoded ideas). If they won't cooperate, take it away from them. (Rostow must have had more than a little influence over our Lao policy.)

"Rising tensions or pleas of our allies or of the American public must be ignored in any crisis with Russia. The temptation must be avoided to prolong or expand any crisis in an effort to degrade or embarrass the Soviets in the eyes of the world."

Our goal should not be victory over Russia ("no-win") but "victory of men and nations over the forces that wish to entrap and exploit their revolutionary aspirations." (That term "revolutionary" has always had an unpleasant connotation, as far as we're concerned.)

More than anything else, the United States must show the Communists that it has no aggressive intentions—that we only want peace.

What lies behind all of these incredible proposals? Apparently Mr. Rostow believes that the Communists have abandoned their longstanding goal of world conquest. Never

mind that military and intelligence sources have been unable to find a shred of evidence to substantiate this conclusion. Mr. Rostow is sure.

In fact, he has been sure that the Communist world and its leaders have been changing—"mellowing" is the word he uses—for about 6 years. In 1956, Rostow expounded his theory concerning the Communist "evolution"—and he even included Red China.

In his latest report to the President, Rostow admits that there isn't any real evidence to back up his conclusions. Since this is true, he says, it will be hard to convince Congress and the American people that he is right. But it must be done, he says. And in order to do it, an educational campaign must be started.

So sit tight, friends, we may be barraged with a bevy of propaganda from Foggy Bottom designed to convince us that the world is flat again.

SUPREME COURT DECISION ON PRAYERS IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the decision of the Supreme Court yesterday respecting the matter of prayers in the public schools of New York has many distressing aspects, and I find myself very unhappy about that majority decision.

The minority opinion, expressed by Justice Potter Stewart, was printed in full in the New York Times this morning, and I ask unanimous consent that it may appear following my remarks this morning in the body of the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit I.)

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, Justice Stewart points out the many instances in which prayer is required by Federal law. Every Senator, when he takes his oath of office, pledges himself to fulfill his duties with the help of Almighty God. The same is true in the House of Representatives. A few years ago—I think in 1954—in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag, we inserted the words "under God."

I think this decision of the Supreme Court is most unfortunate and divisive and quite unnecessary, and I hope that those who are interested in this subject will read the opinion of Justice Potter Stewart, because I think he puts the whole question in the proper perspective. I wish the majority of the Court had heeded his opinion on this issue.

EXHIBIT I

DISSENTING OPINION BY JUSTICE STEWART

A local school board in New York has provided that those pupils who wish to do so may join in a brief prayer at the beginning of each school day, acknowledging their dependence upon God and asking His blessing upon them and upon their parents, their teachers, and their country. The Court today decides that in permitting this brief non-denominational prayer the school board has violated the Constitution of the United States. I think this decision is wrong.

The Court does not hold, nor could it, that New York has interfered with the free exercise of anybody's religion. For the State courts have made clear that those who object to reciting the prayer must be entirely free of any compulsion to do so, including any "embarrassment and pressures." *West Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnette*, 319 U.S. 624. But the Court says that in permitting schoolchildren to say this

simple prayer, the New York authorities have established "an official religion."

With all respect, I think the Court has misapplied a great constitutional principle. I cannot see how an "official religion" is established by letting those who want to say a prayer say it. On the contrary, I think that to deny the wish of these schoolchildren to join in reciting this prayer is to deny them the opportunity of sharing in the spiritual heritage of our Nation.

The Court's historical review of the quarrels over the Book of Common Prayer in England throws no light for me on the issue before us in this case. England had then and has now an established church. Equally unenlightening, I think, is the history of the early establishment and later rejection of an official church in our own States. For we deal here not with the establishment of a state church, which would, of course, be constitutionally impermissible, but with whether schoolchildren who want to begin their day by joining in prayer must be prohibited from doing so. Moreover, I think that the Court's task in this as in all areas of constitutional adjudication, is not responsibly aided by the uncritical invocation of metaphors like the "wall of separation," a phrase nowhere to be found in the Constitution. What is relevant to the issue here is not the history of an established church in 16th century England or in 18th century America, but the history of the religious traditions of our people, reflected in countless practices of the institutions and officials of our Government.

PRAYERS IN GOVERNMENT

At the opening of each day's session of this Court we stand, while one of our officials invokes the protection of God. Since the days of John Marshall our crier has said, "God save the United States and this honorable Court." Both the Senate and the House of Representatives open their daily sessions with prayer. Each of our Presidents, from George Washington to John F. Kennedy, has upon assuming his office asked the protection and help of God.

The Court today says that the State and Federal Governments are without constitutional power to prescribe any particular form of words to be recited by any group of the American people on any subject touching religion. The third stanza of "The Star-Spangled Banner," made our national anthem by act of Congress in 1931, contains these verses:

"Blest with victory and Peace, may the
Heav'n rescued land
Praise the pow'r that hath made and pre-
served us a nation.
Then conquer we must, when our cause it is
just, and this be our motto 'In God is
our trust.'"

In 1954 Congress added a phrase to the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag so that it now contains the words "one nation under God, indivisible with liberty and justice for all." In 1952 Congress enacted legislation calling upon the President each year to proclaim a national day of prayer. Since 1865 the words "In God we trust" have been impressed on our coins.

Countless similar examples could be listed, but there is no need to belabor the obvious. It was all summed up by this Court just 10 years ago in a single sentence: "We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a supreme being." *Zorach v. Clauson*, 343 U.S. 306, 313.

I do not believe that this Court, or the Congress, or the President has by the actions and practices I have mentioned established an "official religion" in violation of the Constitution. And I do not believe the State of New York has done so in this case. What each has done has been to recognize and to follow the deeply entrenched and highly

cherished spiritual traditions of our Nation—traditions which come down to us from those who almost 200 years ago avowed their "firm reliance on the protection of divine providence" when they proclaimed the freedom and independence of this brave new world.

I dissent.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST IMPORTS OF U.S. PRODUCTS

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, as we prepare to consider trade policy legislation, there is one item I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues. Under the Trade Agreements Act as extended in the past, we have gained certain tariff reductions from other countries in return for concessions we have made. However, one fact has been that devices other than tariffs and duties have been used by many foreign nations to discriminate against imported products.

I have done a brief research job—and a hasty one, I am afraid—but it points out some of the mechanisms used which are known by different names. For instance, permits are still used in Great Britain, which must be granted by the government before any foreign products can be imported. While there is no specific duty or tariff imposed, the necessity of securing a permit, for instance, effectively prohibits U.S. coal from being sold in that country.

I ask unanimous consent that a short analysis I have had prepared be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEVICES, OTHER THAN TARIFFS AND DUTIES CURRENTLY USED BY FOREIGN NATIONS TO DISCRIMINATE AGAINST IMPORTED PRODUCTS

There is a tendency to assume that the negotiation of trade agreements between nations deals largely, or principally, with the arbitration of tariffs and duties. Listed below, therefore, are several devices which, even in the complete absence of any tariff or duty, serve effectively to restrict trade in a broad range of selected products and commodities.

Permits: A device, such as used in Great Britain, which must be granted by the Government before any foreign products are allowed to be imported. While there is no specific duty or tariff imposed, the necessity of securing a permit, for instance, effectively prohibits U.S. coal from being sold in that country.

Subventions: A device, such as used in Canada, to subsidize the transportation of fuels from domestic producers to domestic consumer so as to render the use of Canadian fuels economically competitive.

Subsidies: A device, such as used in Great Britain, to permit nationalized industries to selectively reduce prices, thereby replacing foreign products.

Import licenses: A device, such as used by most member nations of the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs, which may effectively prohibit free trading on a broad range of protected domestic commodities.

Exchange controls: A device, such as used in Italy, which in effect controls imports through the restriction of sales of foreign exchange currency by the government.

Allocations: A device, such as used in Japan, which stipulates the amount of currency which may be spent on the purchase of certain imports.

Legalized certificates: A device, such as used in Brazil, which controls imports of selected raw materials by requiring a certificate to be legalized by the Executive Commission for the specified commodity group.

Road use tax: A device, such as used in Austria, which taxes automobiles on the cylinder volume basis. This tax falls most heavily on U.S. passenger cars which have larger and slower turning engines than their counterparts in most European cars to provide longer wear and more trouble-free operation.

Annual road tax: A device, such as used in Belgium and Luxembourg which, although it applies to both domestically assembled cars as well as imports, taxes automobiles on their fiscal hp. The rates are nonlinear, rising sharply to the higher hp. ranges, so that the tax payable on an American car may be several times that of a European car with a higher retail price.

Circulation tax: A device, such as used in Italy, where vehicles are taxed annually on the engine hp. The disadvantage to U.S. vehicles, with their larger hp., is compounded by the fact that this tax is constant and does not diminish with the age of the car.

Sales tax: A device, such as used in Portugal, where taxes are levied on the basic retail price of the import, separate and apart from duties or tariffs.

Import tax: A device, such as used in Greece, where a levy is made upon the c.i.f. (cost, insurance, and freight) value of the imported product.

Luxury tax: A device, such as used in Greece, where a tax is imposed on the c.i.f. value of certain foreign imports.

Primage tax: A device, such as used in Australia, where additional taxes are levied upon goods not considered essential. This device is usually not applied to imports from other Commonwealth nations.

Turnover equalization tax: A device, such as used in the Federal Republic of Germany, where a tax separate and apart from duties and tariffs is imposed on the duty paid value of the selected imports.

Customs stamp tax: A device, such as used in France, where a tax is imposed on the total of all customs charges.

Compensatory import tax: A device, such as used in Italy, where a tax on the duty and sales tax paid value is levied against selected imports.

Fiscal tax: A device, such as used in Spain, where a tax is levied against the duty paid value of selected foreign imports.

Value added tax: A device, such as used in France, where a levy, separate and apart from duties and tariffs, is laid upon the importation of certain selected items such as small motors and compressors.

Fiscal levy: A device, such as used in Switzerland, where a tax separate and apart from duties and tariffs, is levied upon the duty paid value of selected imports.

Stamp tax: A device, such as used in Switzerland, where a tax is laid upon all charges against selected imports, and which appears on the Swiss customs receipt.

Tariff quota: Under a tariff quota, imports of a commodity up to a specified volume are permitted to enter a country at a special low rate of duty but any imports in excess of this minimum volume are permitted to enter only through payment of a higher rate of duty.

Sanitary restrictions: Devices, such as used in Denmark, Sweden, and Great Britain, which effectively restrict and prohibit imports of selected items such as dairy and poultry products.

Bilateral quota: A bilateral quota is arrived at through negotiation between the importing country and a particular supplier country, or between the importing country and export groups with the supplier country. A common result is a rationalization of

the export market and the channeling of abnormal quota profits to special groups.

Arbitrary interest rates: A device, such as used in Italy, where low-interest loans are available to farmers who purchase domestic equipment but where higher interest rates are charged if foreign equipment is purchased.

Mixing quota: Numerous countries have in effect regulations which require producers to utilize domestic raw materials, up to a certain proportion, in the production of a finished product. These regulations, sometimes referred to as "linked-usage" regulations, have a quotalike effect in that they serve to limit imports to some relatively fixed ratio of particular domestic production.

Remission restrictions: A device, such as used in Afghanistan, where although an exchange license is not required, permission nevertheless must be obtained to remit foreign currency to exporters abroad.

Cartels: A device, such as used in Belgium, which may have as an effect the direct restraint of imports. For example, two cartels, the "Societe Generale de Belgique" and "Bur-fina," currently control a good deal of the mining, industry, and commerce of Belgium and, therefore, a large portion of the trade between these industries and the rest of the world. The Belgium Government actively and openly supports such cartels.

Unilateral quota: A device by which a country undertakes to fix an absolute limit upon the quantity of a commodity eligible for import during a given period. Such a quota may be formulated either in global terms or on an allocated basis. Under the global quota, imports are admitted from any country or countries up to the full amount of the quota. Under an allocated quota the quantity of imports allowable is apportioned among various supplier countries.

TRADING SYSTEM FOR HANDLING GRAIN

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, with a major share of our attention directed to the problem of agriculture and farm surpluses, we often lose sight of the very vital service performed for this segment of our economy by the grain markets.

For 88 years the Kansas City Board of Trade has made an important contribution to the efficient handling of the complex trading system developed to handle grain.

The Kansas City Star of June 10, 1962, paid a fine tribute to this excellent organization. It also summarized some of the board's current concern with matters before the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARVEST IN A RUSH, BUT SALES TAKE TIME

The wheat harvest season is here. Combines are rolling across yellow fields of ripened grain. Trucks speed from field to local elevator. By the trainload, the grain moves from the elevators to the vast storage bins at the terminal markets.

On the farm, this is the glamour season of the year. Obviously the completely mechanized operation is a big change from the old days of bundle wagons and steam threshers. The big dinners for thresher crews are only memories, yet there is still romance in the gathering of the grain. It is payday, too. The gold of the fields is turned figuratively into the gold of the realm. Literally, not figuratively, the harvested grain returns to growers, hundreds of millions of dollars.

Less apparent to the public than the harvest is the complex trading system that has been developed to handle the grain. Although it is sold today or tomorrow, or put under Government loan, the wheat currently being harvested won't be used this week or even next. It will be utilized throughout the year or it may even be 2 or 3 years before it is ground into flour.

Throughout the year, at the board of trade in Kansas City and at other major grain markets, groups of men will be standing in pits on the exchange floors shouting or signaling their bids or acceptances. Their eyes will be on a huge blackboard where prices of grain, both cash and futures, are posted. Changes seem to come by the minute. In Kansas City another 40 or 50 men on the same exchange floor will be running their hands through samples of grain in wood trays on tables. They are buyers or sellers. More men will be walking hurriedly to their offices. Messengers arrive and leave with important papers. Telephones ring and teletypes click.

The board of trade is a busy place. The casual visitor may look on the activity in complete perplexity.

As a matter of fact, there is a direct correlation between the harvest rush on the farms today and the activity on the grain exchange floor all year long. This is the business (at the board of trade) that handles the grain, gives it a value (price) and stores it. Businesses represented here maintain the quality of the grain and assume the risk. They will have it ready for delivery to consumers when they want it or where they want, tomorrow or next year, in this country or any place in the world.

It is a marketing system that has been developed over a hundred years in this country. Major changes have come in recent years through Government farm programs with supports which are the major factor in establishing wheat prices. But prices still change in response to market demands and the private trade has not been eliminated. It never should be.

The grain trade is under no direct attack from the Government, yet constant vigilance is required to maintain its free-enterprise status.

Even in the new farm bill which is now before Congress, a Senate amendment cautions the Commodity Credit Corporation not to circumvent the channels of private trade. This amendment is a reaffirmation of directions already in the farm laws. The repetition suggests that Congress sees a need for protecting private trade against Government intervention, even though none is contemplated.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, who introduced the amendment, spoke of it as a reminder to the Department of Agriculture. The amendment as adopted by the Senate reads:

"Sec. 405. Nothing contained herein shall be construed as authorizing sales of Commodity Credit Corporation-owned commodities, including sales against payment-in-kind certificates, other than in accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended. Congress hereby reconfirms its longstanding policy of favoring the use by governmental agencies of the usual and customary channels, facilities, and arrangements of trade and commerce, and directs the Secretary of Agriculture and the CCC to the maximum extent practicable to adopt policies and procedures designed to minimize the acquisition of stocks by the CCC to encourage orderly marketing of farm commodities through private competitive trade channels, both cooperative and noncooperative, and to obtain maximum returns in the marketplace for producers and for the Commodity Credit Corporation."

A second amendment introduced by Senator HUMPHREY instructed the Secretary of Agriculture that it was the "sense of the Congress" that the Secretary should use the facilities of farmer cooperatives when feasible. Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, of Louisiana, chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, stated on the floor of the Senate that this amendment did not mean that cooperatives should receive preferential treatment.

There are unavoidable expenses and responsibilities in connection with the moving, storage and delivery of the grain. These expenses must be met. The responsibilities must be accepted, either by the private trade or the Government.

When statements are heard that it is costing the Government a million dollars a day just to store surplus grain, we should realize that these storage charges would accrue whether the grain was in Government or private hands. They become a part of the final cost of the product. Of course, the big surpluses add to the total storage costs.

Back in the 1920's, before this country ever had a farm program, the normal storage charge in elevators was 12 cents a bushel per year. Today, the Government is paying 13½ cents a bushel. Thus the tremendous storage costs today are the result of volume, not of big increases in storage charges.

Storage, of course, is only one part of the grain business. Ironically, although a large share of the payments for storage of huge surpluses has gone to the grain industry, the grain trade in general has opposed the farm programs. Even though Government storage has given them an assured income the grain people would prefer to go back to a completely free market. But few on the trading floor of the Kansas City Exchange expect to live long enough to see this happen. Nevertheless, they argue that the Government program is responsible for the wheat surpluses which confuse farmers, the trade, and Government alike.

An important part of grain trading is the futures market. It is complicated and often misunderstood, yet because of it, trading can be done swiftly and economically on standards that are accepted anywhere in the world.

In handling wheat over long periods, risk is a major factor. There are risks which include all natural hazards such as fire, wind or floods, and product deterioration, but the major and overshadowing risk is price change. The futures market provides a means of shifting this risk—to those who are willing to shoulder it, hoping, of course, to make a profit.

Boards of trade provide facilities for members to trade in futures. Explanations of futures trading reveal that the actual "commodity" bought or sold on a futures market is a contract. This contract is a promise to deliver or accept delivery of a specified quantity of grain at a specified time and place. The grain doesn't actually change hands until the contract becomes due.

An example of the use of the futures markets can be taken from a practice of flour mills, a practice that might be likened to insurance. A mill which has contracted to deliver flour in September, for instance, buys a corresponding amount of wheat on the futures market to protect itself against a price change until the flour is delivered. Or a mill, as it fills its bins with wheat which will be milled later, sells futures as a hedge against a drop in the price of the grain.

The futures market also provides the mechanics for fulfillment of promises to deliver or receive products at a specified time in the future. Such a system is a necessary part of handling a commodity that is harvested in a matter of weeks, yet consumed throughout the year. Futures also have the very im-

portant function of giving a value on grain harvested today that is somewhere near the value it will have when it is finally sold for consumption. The futures market acts to equalize the price throughout the year.

Theoretically, the difference between a cash and futures quotation would be the cost of holding the commodity from the date of the futures purchases until the contract was completed. But prices on the commodity itself change as a result of many factors. This brings speculators into the market, a necessity if hedging is to be carried on successfully. These speculators are willing to assume a part of the risk of price changes, a very large and essential function in the marketing process.

The charge once made that speculators were gamblers seldom is heard today. The functions of the trade have become better understood and abuses have been eliminated through regulations.

In addition to providing the facilities for hedging, the futures market encourages an efficient information system. Supply and demand factors are continuously analyzed and price quotations are widely disseminated. The machinery is set up for a uniform system of weighing, grading, inspection and the settlement of trade disputes.

The proponents of the grain trading system in the United States maintain that it is the most efficient in the world. It is not, however, the only method of handling the marketing of grain. In fact, it is not duplicated in any other country of the world.

The futures markets are regulated by the Government's Commodity Exchange Authority and by the exchange organizations themselves. Such regulations are necessary and merit the support of the trade.

What the trade fears, and legitimately, is a gradual encroachment of the Government into the marketing system itself. The Government, for instance, owns facilities for storing a billion bushels of grain, space that was acquired under the pressing growth of surpluses. Congress has instructed the Department of Agriculture to utilize private storage facilities wherever feasible, in preference to Government-owned bins. But it is not difficult to surmise the development of a demand for the Government to use its available bins before it adds big storage costs by paying commercial elevator people.

In the last year the Department of Agriculture has sold millions of bushels of corn from its bins in order to control the corn market. It even went so far as to get a railroad rate reduction on the shipment of corn to the southeast part of the United States. Its purpose was to hold prices below the regular market values in that area.

The corn sales functioned as a pressure on farmers, forcing them to join the Government's acreage reduction program. It was Government policy to hold down prices on corn grown by farmers who did not choose to join in the program. The Government, not the market, set the price on corn by the amount it released for sales from day to day.

Thus the trade wonders what the next step in Government intervention in the market will be. It welcomes such pledges from the Government as the one contained in the Humphrey amendment to the Senate's farm bill. Yet private business can't completely uncross its fingers. The trend to Government intervention always seems to be in one direction—toward more and more.

Kansas City is at the hub of the greatest grain-producing area of the world. It is one of the Nation's largest storage and processing centers. Grain is one of our biggest industries, year in and year out. We are especially aware of its importance at harvest time. Kansas City has a vital interest in the grain trade and its future as a part of the free enterprise system.

DISTORTION OF THE CONSTITUTION BY THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak for 8 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, for some years now the members of the Supreme Court have persisted in reading alien meanings into the Constitution of the United States. Through interpretations which cannot be sustained by either the language of the Constitution or the intent of its framers, they have sought, in effect, to change our form of government.

But never in the wildest of their excesses, Mr. President, have they gone as far as they did on yesterday when—in a gross distortion of the first amendment—six of the Justices decreed that the voluntary saying of nondenominational prayers in public schools is unconstitutional.

It was an outrageous edict which has numbed the conscience and shocked the highest sensibilities of the Nation. If it is not corrected, it will do incalculable damage to the fundamental faith in Almighty God which is the foundation upon which our civilization, our freedom, and our form of government rest.

Mr. President, the first amendment is so clear that any fourth grade student can understand it. It says simply that: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Congress has made no such law. No Member of Congress has proposed such a law. And, in the absence of such a law, the Supreme Court is without authority to act on the subject.

In fact, Mr. President, a true interpretation of the spirit of the Constitution would hold that the Supreme Court, not the State of New York, has violated it. That is true because the effect of yesterday's ruling was to prohibit the free exercise of religion by the schoolchildren of the State of New York.

The renowned and respected minister, Dr. Billy Graham, put the matter in its proper perspective with his observation that the Constitution of the United States guarantees freedom of religion—not freedom from religion.

No historical fact is more clearly established than that this country was settled by men and women of great faith who were seeking a home where they and their posterity might worship God in freedom. Every President of the United States from Washington to Kennedy has sworn before God to uphold the Constitution and the laws made under it. Every Member of Congress from the first through the 87th sessions has taken a similar oath.

Both Houses of Congress begin their daily deliberations with prayers. A crier opens the sessions of the Supreme Court itself with the declaration: "God save the United States and this Honorable Court." Our coins feature the motto, "In God We Trust," and we sing the same words

in our national anthem. Our "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag" has been amended to include the phrase, "one nation under God." All branches of the armed services have chaplains of all faiths whose salaries are paid with tax funds. Congress has enacted legislation calling on the President to proclaim a National Day of Prayer each year.

Mr. President, I submit the Supreme Court of the United States on yesterday violated every tenet of American law and every principle of the spirituality of man. It has dealt a blow to the faith of every believer in a Supreme Being and it has given aid and comfort to the disciples of atheism by whatever name they may call themselves.

Mr. President, it is the earnest hope of the junior Senator from Georgia that this unconscionable edict will prove to be the event which arouses the American people to demand action by their elected representatives to put an end once and for all to the ever-broadening judicial encroachments which are destroying freedom and constitutional government in this country.

The psalmist of old declared that "Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord." The junior Senator from Georgia believes with all his heart, Mr. President, that the overwhelming majority of the American people will agree that that man of God was a greater authority on the subject than six politically motivated members of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TALMADGE. I am delighted to yield to my friend from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I warmly commend my distinguished colleague from Georgia for the sentiments he has expressed. I fully concur in the condemnation he has made of the decision. Later today I plan to discuss it at some length, because it is a subject in which I have been interested over a period of years.

Mr. President, our colleague has pointed out that the first amendment relates to an act of Congress. Is that not true?

Mr. TALMADGE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In this case, no act of Congress was involved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Georgia has expired.

Mr. ROBERTSON. May we have 1 additional minute?

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for 1 more minute to the junior Senator from Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am sure my colleague remembers that James Madison was a very religious man. He did not wish to take religion out of Government, but he wished to keep the Government out of religion. He wished to put into the first amendment a prohibition against State laws to establish religions. He could not get that adopted, so the States can go far beyond what New York

did. New York only authorized a brief prayer. Is that not correct?

Mr. TALMADGE. The Senator is eminently correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. It is correct that the decision yesterday related to a State law, and a brief prayer only was involved. As my distinguished friend said, the Supreme Court has again, by judicial fiat sought to amend our Constitution.

Mr. TALMADGE. The Senator is eminently correct. I commend him for his view, and I agree wholeheartedly with it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Georgia may have an additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TALMADGE. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Has it occurred to the distinguished Senator that on the gallery floor of the Capitol, within a stone's throw of where we stand in this Chamber today, there is a chapel furnished by public funds, where a Member of this body or any other person can go to indulge in prayer, to energize his faith, and to find his Maker in his own way?

Mr. TALMADGE. The junior Senator from Georgia is aware of that fact. I compliment and commend the distinguished minority leader for pointing it out during this colloquy.

I call the attention of the distinguished minority leader to the fact that underneath the clock on the wall of this very Chamber is engraved "In God We trust."

I thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois and the distinguished Senator from Virginia for their valuable comments in this discussion.

RECORD OF SERVICE OF PHILIP COOMBS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Mr. Philip Coombs, Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs, has resigned. He has given our country good and faithful service.

I have known Mr. Coombs for many years and consider him an extremely able and dedicated person. He brought new life and vitality into the Office of Educational and Cultural Affairs and made a significant contribution to the total foreign policy of our country by building educational and cultural affairs into a more vital and effective component of U.S. foreign relations.

A careful study of Secretary Coombs' record will reveal the broad scope and the wide range of activities of the educational and cultural affairs program. Mr. Coombs is to be congratulated for his leadership, his dedication, his imagination, in developing and improving the program.

In late April, Mr. Coombs addressed the Annual Conference of the National Association of Foreign Student Advisers. I ask unanimous consent to have the transcript of his address printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRANSCRIPT OF INFORMAL REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE PHILIP H. COOMBS, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS, AT THE ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FOREIGN STUDENT ADVISERS, MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., WEDNESDAY, APRIL 25, 1962

Dr. NEAL. Our next speaker has probably been responsible more than any one individual for the recent concern of the Federal Government with the unsponsored foreign student. The framer of the famous Ten Points familiar to NAFSA, he also has brought into international educational exchange, vigor, imagination, and, above all, close liaison with this association and the institutional spokesmen among its membership.

I present to you now with great pleasure the Honorable Philip H. Coombs, Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs. [Applause.]

Secretary Coombs. Thank you, Joe Neal. I think I should address you as friends and stockholders [laughter], although this year we have to omit the box lunch. [Laughter.]

When I attended the very good reception last night and met so many old friends who had the patience to listen to my remarks on earlier occasions—all the way from New York to San Francisco and even as far away as Athens—Greece, that is—[laughter]—I realized that this was the toughest challenge I have had since coming to Washington. Most of you have heard my standard speech by now and I must try to give you a new one.

I would like to give you a kind of stockholders' report which may help you see in broad perspective what you and other voluntary organizations in the academic community have been accomplishing and what the Government has been doing this past year. I will try also to suggest some of the things that remain to be done next year and thereafter.

I think it can be said in summary—and you people could present much of the evidence—that in the last year the whole question of foreign students in the United States has moved up to a much higher point on the public agenda for discussion and attention and action. The press and other mass media have certainly given the subject more attention—oftentimes, unfortunately, to the more dramatic problem side, thereby getting the picture somewhat out of focus. Nonetheless, it is good that people are thinking more about this important question.

We all know a good deal more than we knew a year ago about the nature of the problems. Certainly I do. I have had some good teachers. I overheard one of your colleagues saying to another last night, "We just got this guy half educated and now we have to start all over again." [Laughter.]

Certainly more than ever before is being done about foreign students to improve their academic and personal experience, their selection, their placement and following up on them when they return home. Much more remains to be done, and there do exist today a good many concrete plans which have been thought out with the help of a great many competent people. Some of these plans are already in motion; others are ready to roll.

I would like to break my remarks into two main parts. First, to give you a panoramic picture of the activities of my office, the Bureau, and other agencies of government. As practitioners with respect to one important aspect of our educational and cultural activities, it is important that you see clearly where your particular important function fits into a larger context.

I know that you think of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs and of my own separate office as being very much concerned with foreign students, which we are. But you should know about some of the other problems and activities we are also concerned with because this will help you relate yourself more effectively to the total picture.

1. THE NEW OFFICE

You will recall that in February, 1961, when President Kennedy and Secretary Rusk established a new Office of Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs, they made it clear that their purpose was to enhance the general role of these activities as a vital component of American foreign policy. They were anxious, among other things, to achieve a greater unity of purpose and direction among the various Federal activities impinging on this area and to achieve a firmer relationship and greater cooperation between the Federal Government and the private sector. It was with this general mandate that we started out.

My own office was set up separately from the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, a fact still not generally understood even within Government. One reason for separating the offices was that the Bureau is a large operating enterprise doing a \$50 million a year business in grants, contracts and other forms. The Bureau requires a full-time top manager.

Clearly, if the new Assistant Secretary was to perform effectively his other duties, which go well beyond the operations of the Bureau, he could not also give fulltime attention to managing the day-to-day operations of the Bureau. We were fortunate, first, in having Saxton Bradford head the Bureau, until he was transferred to Mexico. Now we have Alfred Boerner, an equally able manager, who was called home from Italy to direct the Bureau.

The Assistant Secretary's office is much smaller than the Bureau. It has 9 officers and 6 secretaries; the Bureau has over 300 persons. Attached to the Assistant Secretary's office is also the UNESCO National Commission's Secretariat and the Secretariat for the new U.S. Advisory Commission on International Education and Cultural Affairs.

The office has four principal responsibilities. First, to provide general policy direction and supervision to the Department's own Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs. Secondly, to provide leadership and policy guidance to all Federal agencies engaged in any way in international educational and cultural activities in order to encourage a greater coordination of their efforts and to stimulate a strengthening of those efforts. There are, incidentally, seven Federal agencies that receive direct appropriations for one kind of activity or another in this field. And beyond that, there are well over a dozen additional Federal agencies that cooperate or do contract work in this field.

A third responsibility is to develop U.S. official positions and to maintain relationships with international and regional organizations with respect to educational and cultural matters. At the moment this means primarily UNESCO, the OAS in Latin America, and the newly created Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), covering the Atlantic Community.

The fourth assignment, and I suspect in the long run the most important, is to develop a broader and deeper basis for close cooperation and complementary action between the Federal Government and all non-Federal organizations and institutions around the United States.

2. ESTABLISHING RELATIONS

Carrying out these four assignments effectively requires the development of a very complex pattern of working relationships. We have spent a good deal of time this year

laying out these lines of communication and cooperation, first, within the Federal Government itself, secondly, with the international organizations and foreign governments, and thirdly, with the American academic community, voluntary organizations, foundations, and the like. It required many meetings, discussions, trips, speeches, articles, broadcasts, to get these lines of cooperation established.

I hope you will pardon some personal references here since it is the only way I know to give the stockholders a full report. In addition to the extensive activities of my colleagues, my secretary informs me, I have personally clocked over 75,000 miles of international travel and 30,000 of domestic travel in the past year or so. This involved representing our Government at 5 international conferences and visiting 13 of our overseas missions ranging from Ethiopia, Greece, Thailand, Lebanon, Egypt, Peru, the United Kingdom, Spain, France, Uruguay, India, Chile to Japan. So, if nothing else, I have seen the world this year. [Laughter.]

It involved working with literally dozens of private American organizations and taking on, perhaps foolishly, some 30 speeches at conferences and meetings. We have contributed seven different magazine articles and given about a dozen TV and radio broadcasts. In short, we have been trying to develop a broad educational and cultural community with some common concepts and common goals, cooperating across private and governmental lines and across international boundaries.

I remember an incident a few months ago when a new secretary whom I had not yet met was assigned to our reception office. When she finally asked which man was Mr. Coombs, another girl replied, "He is the man who always comes through with the suitcase." [Laughter.]

What a terrible reputation to have.

3. MAIN POLICY OBJECTIVES

But the year was spent in more than just talking and traveling. We evolved some central policy themes, central objectives, that would guide our efforts and provide a framework within which specific problems and opportunities could be handled. Six principal objectives emerged.

The first and overriding objective was to place these international educational and cultural activities into the mainstream of American foreign relations. In the past they have all too often been regarded as fringe benefits to American foreign relations, good things to do if you can afford it, but not having to do directly and importantly with the serious business of foreign policy. We have endeavored, with much help from others, to give these activities a more important role in foreign affairs.

Now, this took more than just talking about it. It required a series of actions. The first was to deemphasize within the Government's own exchange programs the great emphasis on categories, on quotas, on procedures, and to get much more attention focused on the practical objectives of particular exchanges. We have underscored the fact that an exchange is not in itself an end, it is merely a means to getting some important job accomplished. And the jobs to be accomplished are extremely varied in this exchange field. We are dealing with an array of important U.S. needs and objectives, and with the differing needs and conditions of about 120 other nations and political units.

It required also trying to render these exchange programs much more flexible. There is naturally a tendency—where you have a complex logistical operation involving the movement of many persons and of many checks and the like—for the operation to become too mechanical. It seemed to us that these exchanges should be made much more flexible so that we in Washington and

especially our posts in the field could tailor them to fit individual country situations, rather than treating the exchange program as a kind of monolithic worldwide mechanism.

Thus, another step toward putting these activities into the mainstream was to place more emphasis on country planning, on the part of our cultural attachés, the binational commissions and others. This means relating the exchange programs to the particular needs and priorities and objectives applying to each individual country with all of its special characteristics, and also achieving a greater integration of these activities with other relevant activities, such as the AID program, in each country. This is entirely in harmony with the philosophy of the new AID program, with its emphasis on country planning.

It means also strengthening the liaison between the people operating the exchange programs and those engaged in broader analysis of country situations, such as the desk officers and the regional officers in the State Department, the officials in USIA who are responsible for particular regions and countries, and similarly the AID officials.

Both in Washington and the field, it means achieving closer collaboration and joint planning between the exchange activities and other related activities of USIA and AID, and the Office of Education, the National Science Foundation and other Federal agencies, as well as private foundations that operate overseas.

Well, this, then, was the first broad policy theme and objective: to put educational and cultural affairs into the mainstream of U.S. foreign relations.

The second objective was to improve the quality and the effectiveness of these exchange activities, as distinct from expanding the quantity. It is always more dramatic to expand the quantity of something, such as enrollments, but it is sometimes more important to elevate the quality. But how to do this?

Well, one example is an effort in which you people are directly involved, namely, this so-called 10-point program for improving the quality of the experience of foreign students. We will come back to that.

In the leader and specialist program, where several hundred foreign leaders and specialists are brought here each year, there are many points at which the quality of their experience can be and will be improved. For example, we need to use here more flexibility, more freshness, in the programming of foreign visitors. We need, in some cases, to improve hospitality and to improve the quality of the escort and interpreter services. We need to follow up better with these foreign visitors so they won't simply come and go and be forgotten.

Another area where improved quality is needed concerns the American-sponsored schools overseas that serve both foreign students and the children of American employees abroad, both governmental and non-governmental. These schools are extremely important. First, they demonstrate to other countries the high value we attach to the education of our children and the best practices in American education. By educating foreign youngsters we strengthen our international relationships. Most important of all, however, it is crucial that we be able to assure people going overseas in the service of their country that their youngsters can have at least as good an education overseas as they could get in the best of our public schools at home. This has not been the case in the past. We are endeavoring to make it the case in the future.

Then there are opportunities for quality improvement in the kinds of people we send overseas under our exchange programs. Many extremely able and effective people—students, professors, teachers, specialists—

have gone overseas under these programs and rendered great public service. But it is increasingly important, I think, that more of them go to the less-developed countries that know us least and that we know least. Those who go should not only be competent in their own special field but they should understand the American society well and be able to represent it effectively. Whether they like it or not, they are not going to be regarded merely as experts in psychology or economics or literature. They are going to be ambassadors in their own right to another country. They are going to be educators about the United States. I think this point has been well underscored by the Attorney General only 2 days ago, and before then, following his experiences in visiting the Far East recently.

Likewise, we need in the American specialist program, which sends a few hundred people overseas each year, to send our best, the cream of the crop. We can afford nothing less.

Many of these improvements in quality cost money, but not all. If we are going to improve the quality and effectiveness of these exchanges, we must pay modestly higher unit costs. An increment of funds spent in this direction would buy more results.

The third policy objective has been to achieve a selective quantitative expansion to bring the world pattern of exchanges into a better balance with the pattern of world requirements. The latter pattern has been shifting very rapidly in the last 10 years as new nations have evolved, as U.S. commitments and responsibilities have expanded and shifted. For example, in 1951 there were 62 countries involved in our exchange programs. Today there are 120, nearly a doubling, yet the number of exchanges, in terms of individuals, has gone up only 29 percent in the same period. To be sure, the AID agency, particularly, has moved up in bringing more trainees here, but by and large their objective and function is not the same as that of the Department's exchange program.

This failure of the exchange program to keep pace with evolving world conditions—such as the emergence of new nations in Africa and increased U.S. concern with Latin America—has meant that programs of exchange are seriously underdeveloped with respect to some very important areas of the world. We are therefore seeking to rectify this imbalance by putting greater emphasis in the coming year's program on Africa and Latin America.

To give you an example of this gap between needs and performance, in 19 African countries this year we had funds for only four or fewer leaders and specialists to be invited to visit the United States, at a time when clearly it is important for them to get to know us better and for us to get to know them better. It is vital to our national interest and theirs for them to see for themselves what we are really like in contrast to the misconceptions that our foreign friends so often have of us.

A fourth major policy objective has been to give greater emphasis to the key role of human resource development in the total process of national economic and social development.

The whole theory of economic development is still in its infancy; it has engaged the serious attention of economists only in the last 15 years. The tendency—and I say this as one of those strange animals called economists—has been quite understandably to focus attention upon those factors of economic growth which can most easily be measured—physical resources, such as power dams, highways, harbors, and the like. These are certainly essential ingredients of economic development, but they do not in themselves constitute an adequate approach. Unless a nation also develops its human

resources, in balance with its physical resources, much investment in physical resources will go down the drain because there will not be the people there to utilize them or to manage them intelligently.

Thus, our office has sought to work with many economists to emphasize that educational expenditures in a developing country are not simply consumption expenditures, not simply social overhead, but are an investment in the true economic sense of the term. Preliminary research done by eminent economists such as Prof. Theodore Schultz of the University of Chicago strongly suggests that in our own national history the yield on investment in human resources through education has been substantially higher than the yield on investment in factories and other physical facilities. Of all nations we should be convinced of the efficacy of investment in human resource development.

The implications of this thesis for economic development overseas are, first, that educational development planning must be integrated with overall economic and social development planning in the developing nation. Steps have been taken to improve the techniques and the concepts of educational development planning.

The second implication is, as I have suggested, that education must be regarded as an investment, although at the same time it yields important consumption results.

The third implication is that there must be a careful balance in any country's development plan between human resources and physical resources.

The fourth implication, and one which I think as educators we need to take most seriously, is that it is not enough even in our own country—not to mention these less developed countries—simply to spend more money on education, to expand the status quo, to do on a larger scale what we are already doing, because what we are doing here and abroad in education is not good enough. The present models of education in many underdeveloped countries are thin carbon copies, obsolete carbon copies, of somebody else's educational system, including the curriculum. It is not fitted to the needs nor the pocketbooks of these countries.

So we require in education—by "we," I mean education all over the world—vast and imaginative internal changes in the curriculum, in the methods of instruction, in the organization of education, in the training of teachers, in the architecture of education, in virtually every aspect. We all need an educational revolution as sweeping and productive as previous revolutions in agriculture, industry, transportation, and other sectors. I am hopeful that our private foundations, as well as the Government, UNESCO, and others, will take strong initiative in launching this revolution to reshape the whole character of present educational systems.

We had opportunities during the year to engage in international discussions along these lines: at the Addis Ababa conference on African education, sponsored by UNESCO; at the recent Santiago conference on Latin American education and the Alliance for Progress; at the recent UNESCO conference on Asian education in Tokyo; and at a quite significant conference held here in Washington last fall by the OECD, which brought together some of the top economists of Western Europe and the United States with some of the top educators (and they got along famously).

This emphasis on the development of human resources and on a comprehensive approach to educational development has also been embraced by the AID program and is already being put to important use. In Africa, for example, the AID program in 1962 has allocated more than \$50 million

to educational development projects, which is nearly double last year's level.

And under the Alliance for Progress, the AID agency has evolved a series of specific policies compatible with this general thesis. At the recent conference in Santiago, in collaboration with the AID people, we were able to announce a whole series of specific actions the United States is prepared right now to take to promote educational development in line with the Punta del Este resolution, if the Latin American countries will do their share.

A fifth policy objective has been to do more, and do it more consciously, to strengthen American education through the exchange programs. Clearly there has been great benefit in the past, through the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt programs and others, to American education in helping to lift our national competence in world affairs, through language and area studies and the like. But there are opportunities to do more of this through a more conscious effort to engage in joint planning and joint operations; for example, between the Department's Exchange Bureau and the Office of Education and its programs under the National Defense Education Act.

This year we have entered into agreements on six specific such opportunities with the Commissioner of Education, including a joint effort to strengthen the linguistic and area centers and the other international activities in American colleges and universities.

Beyond this, the Department has given greater encouragement to imaginative junior-year-abroad programs of American colleges.

Another example is the Department's cooperation with a consortium of 15 American universities concerned with Asian studies, to establish in India a new American-India Institute, which is to serve primarily not the Indians but our own scholars, graduate students and professors who want to go to India to do research on south Asia. We hope that that organization will come into being shortly. It is also an example of collaboration between the Government and private philanthropy—the Department providing support with U.S.-owned rupees, the Ford Foundation providing necessary dollar support.

Finally, the sixth basic policy objective is to achieve a greater complementarity between public and private actions in this whole area. Part of this job involves trying to clarify the natural division of labor between government and nongovernment organizations. I think we have made some headway there, though it is a problem that requires continuing attention. There are some things that private philanthropy, voluntary organizations, and universities can do that the Government simply cannot do and should not try to do. There are other things that only Government can do. And then there is a gray area, in between, where actions by both parties are required to get the job done.

It is clearly important to preserve the integrity of both parties, so that the freedom of choice and decision remains with an individual institution or foundation and so also that the responsibility for Government decision-making rests with responsible Government officials. But this preservation of integrity is not at all incompatible with a harmonizing of public and private activities. This has been clearly demonstrated.

For example, going back to the 10 points, you will recall that one of them had to do with trying to improve curriculum arrangements, especially in the transitional period for foreign students coming for the first time to the United States. I would say this is a problem which clearly the Government cannot handle, and should not try. This is the business of the colleges and universities. Thus, in this case we turned to a committee

of the American Council on Education and asked them to give it their attention, standing ready to assist where we could, but giving them the proper responsibility.

Another small example: The U.S. Government in the past has made contributions to American-sponsored higher education institutions in the Middle East, such as the American universities at Beirut, Cairo, and Robert College in Turkey. It seemed to us that these colleges would benefit in terms of better use of their resources and could be more persuasive to donors, private or public, if they engaged in the kind of long-range planning which some of our domestic institutions have lately been engaging into their benefit. Here again, we did not feel that the Government could properly tell them how to do their planning since they are private institutions. In this instance a private foundation stepped in and provided help to them to develop their own long-range plans. The hope is that they will be in better shape to seek private financial assistance and such governmental assistance as they may wish to seek because they have done a better job of planning.

One of the most important examples of cooperation between the Government and private groups in the past year has been with respect to African students. I won't go into the details, but I think you are all aware that it became highly desirable last spring for my office to call together all of the major private organizations concerned with African students, to get them to harmonize their activities with one another and with the Government, to tackle this very important problem. They did a good job and they are continuing to. I think as time goes on, the fusion of effort here can be even more effective.

4. A CROWDED AGENDA

This, then, was the general framework of policy and objectives of the past year. But within this framework there were carried on a great many more specific activities which ended up in one way or another on a very crowded agenda of important items. Many of these actions were initiated by our office. Others were brought to us. And then there were those bureaucratic foundlings that had never previously had a home and ended up on our new doorstep. So we developed quite an agenda.

Let me run down, to give you a more concrete sense of the nature of the activities, a number of the items which took a good deal of our energy. They are highly diverse but I think you will see that they all represent separate strands in a strengthening fabric of educational and cultural affairs in relation to world affairs.

First, of course, there was the new Fulbright-Hays Act. That took a good deal of work, first to suggest changes in the original bill which in the view of the administration would make it a better bill. There were long hours of hearings and preparations for hearings. Since the passage of the act in September there have been many follow-up actions, though the act does not become fully operative until July 1 of this year.

There had to be an Executive order drafted and negotiated with various Federal agencies, which I can assure you is a very long and arduous process. There had to be established a new U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, which is more or less the "board of directors" for all activities under the Fulbright-Hays Act. I am happy to say that the President succeeded in persuading and appointing a very distinguished group of citizens, headed by Dr. John Gardner of the Carnegie Corp., to take on the responsibilities of this new Commission.

At the same time, other Commissions, such as the Board of Foreign Scholarships, the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, required replacements. Here again the

sights have been held high and the quality of the people appointed to these important Commissions is outstanding.

Another major item on the agenda, which I won't go into in detail, is of course again this matter of African students. I think they have done more to put the whole subject of foreign students on the map than anything else. To hear the talk, you would think that well over half of the foreign students were from Africa. Only 3.7 percent, in the latest count, are from there.

By the way, we received only yesterday some preliminary figures from IIE's "open doors" census, which indicate that in the current academic year, there has been an overall increase over the previous year of something like 40 percent in the number of students from Africa, including north Africa, studying in the United States.

The third topic was the whole matter of educational development in Africa, which is in a sense a balance to the bringing of African students here. Our office established a task force of eminent private and Government experts to develop long-range guides to helping new African nations develop their educational systems. We have been to two international conferences on the subject, worked closely with private foundations, with the AID program, with the American Council on Education (which has a special committee on Africa), and we have cooperated with groups such as Educational Services, Inc., at MIT to develop new techniques of instruction and programmed learning for Africa. This has been a most exciting enterprise.

A fourth and quite different topic has to do with the teaching of English abroad as a second language. We got into this primarily because there were five separate Federal agencies engaged in this business, which may sound silly but actually there is a very good and justifiable reason why there should be five. But, being five, it is important that they follow the same road map and have some reasonable division of labor.

In this field also the British are very active and are anxious to harmonize their efforts with ours, because the rapidly rising worldwide demand to learn English is fast outstripping the combined capacity of the United States, the United Kingdom and other English-speaking countries to meet the demand. This suggests that in this field also there needs to be technological innovation, because the highest input requirement for teaching English is skilled manpower, which is in very scarce supply. We have been working closely with the Center for Applied Linguistics and other groups, encouraging them to devise a new technology of instruction in English.

I have mentioned also the fifth item, the U.S.-sponsored schools abroad. This has involved us in much detailed work with other agencies, especially AID.

A sixth item has involved working with the international organizations to help strengthen their role in education and culture, and to help get their programs properly meshed so that they would neither conflict or run off fruitlessly in separate directions. Here we have worked especially with UNESCO, the OECD, and the OAS.

A seventh important topic has been the role of education in the Alliance for Progress, which I have just mentioned. Here again we established a task force of expert people outside and inside the Government. We went to Punta del Este, in the American delegation, and achieved with the help of our colleagues in the other American Republics a comprehensive resolution at Punta del Este on educational and cultural and scientific development. It was that resolution that provided the groundwork for the recent conference at Santiago, where the ministers of education and other experts throughout Latin America came to grips with

how to translate that general resolution into concrete action and progress.

The eighth topic, which I have alluded to already, is the stimulation of new technologies, fresh imaginative approaches in education, where we have worked again closely with UNESCO. We participated for example in the Purdue international conference on the use of instructional television. We have worked with AID, with the Office of Education, and with various private groups on this subject. I believe that over the next 10 to 20 years this can be one of the most significant subjects in the whole field of international education.

A ninth closely related topic was the whole matter of mass media for education and for cultural development. One side of this problem is that the products of American mass media—films and television programs—are rapidly spreading around the world and having an enormous educational impact, even though they were intended to be entertaining.

Some of you have heard me tell the story, a true one, of the Nigerian villager being interviewed a while back by a BBC researcher who was looking into the impact of television of the Western World on less-developed areas, and the villager said, "When are you people going to get automobiles like we have? All you ride is horses." [Laughter.]

And the average person on the street in Japan can tell you he doesn't have to come to the United States to learn about us. He knows all about us now. He has seen our movies and our television programs. Something like 40 percent of television time in Tokyo is canned American entertainment programs. Now, it's fine for entertainment, but it seems to me we need to work hard to get more educational programs of a good quality, cultural programs of a good quality into international circulation—to show a different side of American life, and sometimes a more significant and loftier side. So we have done what we could to encourage a further flow.

One other item which I have mentioned already has been the integration of the State Department's exchanges with the work of the Office of Education to help develop greater competence among Americans in world affairs and to help strengthen American educational institutions. Educational exchanges are a two-way matter, and this country can benefit greatly from the foreigners who come to study and work with us.

Just to skip down a few other items without comment, to show the variety, we put a good deal of effort into evolving and following through on the foreign student services program. We have put much time in on developing improvements of management and organization, both in the Bureau and in my own office. We have worked on strengthening American studies in foreign institutions that are interested in adding this dimension to their curriculum.

A good deal of attention has been required for the reorientation and strengthening of our cultural presentations program, under which American performing artists, entertainers, and athletes are sent to other countries. We were engaged in the planning and negotiation of the extension of the United States-U.S.S.R. Exchange Agreement. One of the high-water marks of the year was the agreement to admit Benny Goodman to the Soviet Union. This is the first time the Soviet Government has been willing to have a jazz orchestra, even though a relatively moderate one. [Laughter.]

And evidences now are that, having made the decision, they are very enthusiastic about it. There is something profoundly important about having Benny Goodman and his colleagues play in the Soviet Union.

Another focal point of attention has been the new East-West Center in Hawaii, which I believed all along had a great potential for

contributing to the national interest and to the interests of Asian countries; it was just getting started a year ago and needed help to get on a firm track. I think in the past 12 months the East-West Center, with help from distinguished American educators on the mainland, has gotten on a firm track. It has an outstanding new chancellor, who has already assembled a strong staff of deputies. Improvements have been made in the selection process, both overseas and in the United States. The program has been sharpened up to focus on those things which can be done with distinction. The ties with American mainland universities are being laid out and I think the Center is now well on its way to a distinguished future.

Also, speaking of Asia, we gave a good deal of attention to strengthening American-Japanese educational and cultural relationships, which is certainly one of the most important forms of relationship between Japan and the United States. There was a highly successful conference in Tokyo in January pursuant to an agreement reached between Prime Minister Ikeda and President Kennedy when the Prime Minister visited here last summer. The American delegation to that conference was made up, significantly, with a majority of private and nongovernmental people. It contained such representatives of the arts and literature and cultural affairs as Aaron Copland, Robert Penn Warren, and Arthur Schlesinger, among other distinguished and accomplished people in these fields. That conference resulted in spelling out a series of specific steps that can be taken—and will, we hope—by the governments and private sectors in each country in cooperation with one another to build broader bridges of understanding through cultural and educational interchange.

Another task was to put together, for the first time, a consolidated overall picture of this whole field of exchanges. That has been done. It needs to be further spelled out, and we need to strengthen further the consultation among these agencies that is required for better coordination.

Another big topic has been the whole matter of books. We feel that the Alliance for Progress, for example, should have as one of its major ingredients a strong effort to develop a large flow of low-cost books, textbooks, technical books, good literary books, and the like for Latin America. This will do much to encourage a great engagement of the intellectual groups in Latin America and the rest of the Western World. Progress has been made, and further progress will be made in this effort.

We have been putting greater emphasis on young people in all of the exchanges, and more emphasis on women leaders. These emphases will be reflected in the coming year's program. We spent considerable time, of course, developing the 1963 plans for the Bureau and for my own office. And these are reflected in the budget that is now before the Congress.

One of the more esoteric problems which I inherited quite unwittingly was the preservation of the Nubian monuments. And one of the more delightful aspects of our work involved the bringing to the United States from the U.A.R., for the first time anywhere, of some of the precious relics from the tomb of King Tutankhamen—some of you will remember him as King Tut. This collection is now touring the United States and is, incidentally, breaking museum attendance records everywhere along the way.

We have even gotten into the whole question of the exchange programs, the training programs, of the Department of Defense, which brings over each year a substantial number of young officers for technical training. It has been our objective to try to help broaden the character of their social experience and their intellectual opportunities while they are in the United States.

So much for the general report to the stockholders. I don't want to hold you longer, but I think I am obliged to tell you with respect to the 10-point program—which gets down to the brass tacks of your field—that since that program was announced a whole series of actions have been taken and a whole series of concrete plans have been made. We hope these plans will roll into action with the new budget year.

I am indebted primarily to Donald B. Cook and to Harold E. Howland for having picked up this ball and run with it, and to many others in the Bureau who have helped. We have had help from other Federal agencies too. A special staff unit was set up in the Bureau to focus on foreign students. A series of advisory meetings was held. Some of you have been there. Foreign student advisers, leaders of community service groups, government people, business and labor officials, and university officials met with us in Washington to tackle different points on the agenda, to advise on Government action, and we hope to be stimulated to even greater action on the private side.

There have been a number of conferences and other general meetings at which this subject has been discussed. We have had some broadcasts on the subject and those of you who can get to a radio at the proper time, Monday night, can hear a broadcast which was taped only recently by one of your colleagues, Father Yates, Justice William O. Douglas, and Al Sims of IIE and myself on this whole question of foreign students. And we hope that the CBS station in New York (WCBS) will pass that same program on to some of the other CBS-owned stations in your areas of the country. Maybe you should ask them to.

The Bureau prepared an up-to-date bibliography on the best materials available on student counseling and circulated it to all of the cultural attachés overseas. Work has been done toward evolving a system of overseas counseling offices. Two, as you may know, have already been set up under private support through the Institute of International Education, one in Africa and one in Latin America. They will be good test cases, and I hope that in the next few years we will see the evolution of a whole pattern of good counseling offices overseas.

Summer employment and training opportunities for foreign students has been a major item on our recent agenda. We have conferred with business and labor leaders. We have identified 50 communities that have a high proportion of foreign students in them and made a contract with IIE to try to get something going for this summer in these areas on employment opportunities for foreign students. IIE has sent three people into the field to work with these communities.

The U.S. Employment Service has cooperated fully, and its 2,000 regional and branch offices around the country have been given briefing materials and instructions to do everything they can for foreign students. The Secretary of State has addressed a letter to college and university alumni through the American Alumni Council and the alumni magazines represented by its members, to call attention to the need for summer jobs for foreign students and the national opportunity this presents.

Another development has been the preparation of a how-to-do-it book for individual communities to give them suggestions, based on the experience of other communities, on how they can play a larger and more effective role in relation to foreign students.

Some time ago, as many of you know, we sent a letter to 1,200 college and university presidents telling them all we knew about the problems and the opportunities relating to African students. We felt that their institutions necessarily had to take much of

the responsibility for the selection process, for the curriculum, for the general care and guidance of the African students. We got a very good response to this advisory letter from the presidents.

We are in consultation with experts on the development of better English proficiency tests. We hope that out of that will come another instrument to improve selection. Incidentally, the college entrance examination board has entered this field now. It has sent a competent person to Latin America to see if they can't help evolve an indigenous college board screening test in Spanish that would provide American institutions a much better tool for evaluating Latin American applicants.

We have worked with the National Student Association, with the Red Cross and others to try to get stronger student-to-student efforts going—not to orient foreign students to Americans, but to orient American students to foreign students. This, by the way, ought to be added to the 10-point program to make it an 11-point program. It was an oversight.

We have worked with the Immigration and Naturalization Service to try to make the visa process less complicated, but also more effective in guiding the universities and the foreign students. There is a new form I-20 which, I am assured, will give our officers in the field a much better basis for evaluating the position of a foreign student financially and otherwise. That isn't to say they evaluate their quality as students but rather their eligibility for receiving a visa.

A variety of plans for foreign student services have been evolved, at least in preliminary form. They will take a great deal more working out, with the help of people like yourself. But they have been outlined during our budget hearings and a substantial sum requested to get started in this whole field of foreign student services during fiscal year 1963, which begins on July 1.

Now, these are things which the Government has been involved in. We are aware that there have been many other things going on outside the Government. We know, for example, that some of the foundations have assisted on the African student problem far more than they had before. They have also contributed to the setting up of counseling offices overseas.

I have mentioned the initiative by the college board in getting into this area of selection of students from overseas. We know that many colleges and universities have quickened the pace of their own actions and put more resources into this whole effort. We know that in various communities the voluntary organizations have been pulling themselves more closely together for a stronger combined effort—in areas such as Boston, New York, through the Greater New York Council, and Chicago, and a number of others.

One of the most significant things, I think, is that national conferences of educators and of professional societies and the like are putting this subject on the agenda of their discussion meetings. This is something you can do something about. I think that if you can get such discussion when groups that can do something about it get together—if you can urge them to get the subject of foreign students on the agenda—it will help the whole thing along. One way to help it along is by working within your own colleges or universities where various professors and administrators are officers of these organizations.

One of the most gratifying reports I have heard came from a young lady who works with the Fulbright Commission in Paris. Last summer in Paris I mentioned that one of the big things we wanted to do was to encourage better overseas guidance and

counseling. Frankly, I had reference largely to Africa, Asia, and Latin America; but the first report I have heard—of an initiative taken in the field to follow through on this—concerns what's now going on in Paris. There is underway a real effort to get better guidance and counseling there.

Looking at the year as a whole, I think it can fairly be said there has been a good deal of activity in and out of the Government and also overseas. There is certainly a new sense of movement in this whole area, including foreign students. There is a greater sense, I think, that this field is important, that the Government thinks it is and that private people think it is. Old programs have been undergoing appraisal, reappraisal and reorientation, and new plans have been evolved. Some have already been put in motion. Others will be soon. There have been some very real practical accomplishments.

But more than anything, I think there is a stronger and clearer recognition than ever before of the enormous amount of work that still remains to be done.

One thing I would say in closing is that I have learned more about voluntary private organizations this year. I have felt a little like De Tocqueville going around our country and, you remember, characterizing us as a nation of voluntary organizations. I think that without these organizations this effort could never have developed over the last 50 years as it has. And it certainly won't get far in the next 5 years without a concerted effort by voluntary organizations.

There are hazards that need to be faced. There is a great need for a system of consultation among voluntary organizations, a division of labor among them, and a continuing effort for them to find ways to coordinate their efforts. The hazard I spoke of is one of fragmentation. There are many natural built-in forces of fragmentation in this field that have to be guarded against. I think it's extremely important that all of the voluntary organizations maintain a broad view of the total context in which their activities occur, not only the context within which foreign student activities fit.

I think, in a final statement to the stockholders, one can say the same thing that one can say to a conference of college presidents: that the most heartening thing any business can look forward to is a booming market. In education the booming market has always worried the educators terribly, though after all it really offers a very great opportunity. I think in the whole field of foreign students you have a booming market to look ahead to.

Thank you. [Applause.]

ACTION IN STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, some time ago I read an article in the local press which indicated that a very important facility and operation of the State Department, known as the Crisis Center, was being abandoned.

The Crisis Center was established during the Eisenhower administration in order to facilitate and expedite information and reporting in the State Department. At the time of its establishment, the Crisis Center received considerable favorable comment and justly so.

My concern over the alleged abandonment of this project prompted me to write a letter to the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Affairs, Mr. Fred Dutton. I have received a reply from Mr. Dutton, and I ask unanimous consent that both of the communications referred to be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 30, 1962.

The Honorable FRED DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary, Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRED: I wish to call to your attention a clipping that has been on my desk for several months.

What has happened to the Crisis Center? I have understood for some time that the oldline State Department offices have fought this Center because it cuts across bureau lines and apparently violates some of the traditional concepts of an organizational chart.

As I recall, this Crisis Center was established because of the need for prompt action and response in the State Department. The long delay in getting action through the normal channels of any big Government department has necessitated some form of ad hoc organization to give attention to urgent matters. I know that the Crisis Center was established because there simply had to be a way for this huge Government of ours to respond quickly and intelligently to developments which were taking place so rapidly and unexpectedly that it was literally impossible for the regular bureaus and agencies of Government to cope with them.

I ask that you give me a report on the Crisis Center, what is its status, how many persons are assigned, what is their rank, what do they do, what are the plans for it? I am keenly interested in this matter, and I believe that this letter should be brought to the attention of the Secretary.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

MAY 8, 1962

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I have reviewed your letter of April 30 with Mr. William Brubeck, Executive Secretary of the Department, who is now responsible for the direction of the Operations or Crisis Center.

As you know, the Operations Center was set up a year ago as an experiment in order to assure rapid coordination in the development of policy to meet critical situations. As the Center evolved over the ensuing months, it became increasingly apparent that the unit's functions to a considerable extent overlapped those of the Executive Secretariat, which is the instrument of the Secretary for operational management of the Department. A decision was consequently made to place the Operations Center directly under the Secretary so that its activities could be more effectively coordinated with the other elements of the Secretariat. This was done in mid-January 1962 and formalized in the attached departmental circular of March 7.

A meaningful round-the-clock watch is now being maintained in the Operations Center as the central command post for rapid communication and coordination of urgent matters in the Department. This watch is manned by five teams of three officers, each ranging in grade from FSO-3 to FSO-8. Each watch is responsible during its tour of duty for monitoring telegrams from abroad and communicating fast alerts to action officers and, where appropriate, key officers of the Department at any time of day or night. In addition, the watch maintains continuous liaison with its counterparts in the White House, Defense Department, and intelligence community in order to assure full exchange of information on critical, quickly developing situations. The watch also maintains secure and rapid telephonic contact with certain of our principal posts abroad and, through these contacts,

is able to keep senior officers informed. The watch staffs, supplemented by the services of three midcareer officers working on rotating schedules, prepare various highly classified summaries of immediate interest to the key officers in the Department and in other elements of the executive branch.

The foregoing activities are under the general direction of the Executive Secretary of the Department and specific direction of a senior officer who has been designated as Acting Director and has been with the Operations Center since its inception.

As of today, there are 19 officers directly assigned to the Operations Center to carry on the activities described above. There is also backstopping potential from the entire staff of the Executive Secretariat.

In order to improve the conduct of these activities, a small consultative group has been brought together with representatives from the Defense Department and the intelligence community cooperating. It is also anticipated that requests will be made in the very near future for the development and purchase of technical equipment and technical support principally in the field of communications. I believe these steps suggest the careful attention being given to this operation.

The Secretary will be most interested in your letter, and it will be shown to him immediately upon his return from his present trip abroad.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON.

OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY—
REORGANIZATION

1. Direction of the Operations Center has been assigned to Lucius D. Battle, the Executive Secretary of the Department of State. In addition to functions previously performed, the Executive Secretary is responsible for watch operations and for service and support to task forces and similar working groups.

2. In connection with these assignments, the Office of the Executive Secretary is reorganized as follows:

2.1. Under the Executive Secretary, the Operations Center (S/S-O), will maintain a 24-hour, 7-day week global watch and will perform related briefing and alter functions for top officers of the Department, for task forces, and for bureaus, as appropriate. For this purpose, the former Reports Section of S/S-RO has been integrated into the Operations Center. S/S-O has been assigned Reports Section responsibilities for screening and distribution of cables and other traffic for the Secretary and other departments, and for preparation of the top secret, summary, and other reports.

2.2. Permanent deputies of the representatives of other agencies, formerly detailed to Headquarters, Operations Center, are attached directly to the Office of the Executive Secretary (S/S), Office of the Secretary of State.

2.3. The Operations Section of the Reports and Operations Staff (formerly S/S-RO) is redesignated Secretariat Staff, S/S-S. Under the Executive Secretary, S/S-S will continue to perform the previous functions of S/S-RO (other than reports functions discussed above): coordination, followup, and support of work presented to and actions directed by the Secretary, the Under Secretary, the Deputy Secretary for Political Affairs, and the Deputy Under Secretary for Political Affairs; provision of secretariat support for these officers at international conferences, for high-level visits and other major meetings, etc.

2.4. The follow-up responsibilities formerly divided between S/O and S/S-RO have been assigned to a single S/S-S Followup Section, under the direction of the Chief, S/S-S.

2.5. S/S-S will provide the service of a Secretariat officer to task forces and similar

working groups. Certain existing task forces will be given additional support as required.

3. Appropriate changes in the Organization Manual will be issued at a later date.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it will be noted that while the Crisis or Operations Center has been phased out, it has actually been absorbed in the office of the Executive Secretariat. The Department circular of March 7, 1962, describes the reorganization. It appears to me that the new Operations Center fulfills all of the tasks previously performed by the so-called Crisis Center and is better organized insofar as the State Department administrative structure is concerned. The letter from Secretary Dutton, along with the Department circular on the subject "Office of the Executive Secretary—Reorganization," gives the complete story.

I wish to commend the Secretary of State and his Department on the reorganization and express my thanks for the prompt attention to my inquiry.

(At this point Mr. METCALF assumed the chair as Presiding Officer.)

THE PEACE CORPS CELEBRATES AN
ANNIVERSARY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I noted with pleasure an editorial and article which appeared in the New York Times of June 25 noting that today is the first anniversary of the start of training for the first Peace Corps recruits. Although the year has not been a painless one—every new organization has its growing pains and periods of trial—the worst fears of those skeptics who opposed the program remain unfounded and the best hopes of its supporters are well on their way to fulfillment.

In fact, the Peace Corps has shown a striking ability to turn initial skepticism and hostility into more or less fervent enthusiasm. The reason is plain to see. Beatniks and "youthful idealists" have found no opening in the program. At the present time there are 973 volunteers in 16 countries, and over 1,300 recruits are now in training. In the countries where Corps men and women are now stationed, they have been warmly received and have done admirable work in helping the people of these countries to build toward the future. Frequently unorthodox in their methods, the Peace Corps volunteers have never lost sight of their purpose: to help the people among whom they are serving. In teaching, nursing, agriculture, construction, young Americans have made vital contributions to the development of the human and material resources latent in the countries to which they are sent.

As the Times editorial states about the program:

The training at home has been rigorous; in the field the young people have been expected to live as do their native counterparts, often on a fairly Spartan regime; it is the host country and not Washington that decided what shall be done where; and hard work rather than glamour has been the key expression.

May the Peace Corps have a healthy and prosperous future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Peter Braestrup, entitled "Peace Corps Thrives in First Year Abroad," and the editorial "The Peace Corps' First Year," both appearing in the New York Times of June 25, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE CORPS THRIVES IN FIRST YEAR ABROAD—NATIONS ASK MORE AS 1,000TH RECRUIT HEADS OVERSEAS

(By Peter Braestrup)

WASHINGTON, June 24.—The Peace Corps expects to send overseas this week its 1,000th newly trained volunteer.

There are no special plans to celebrate the occasion. The event is regarded as merely another sign that "the push is on" this summer, as one Corps official said. "We're moving from a penny-ante operation into big business," he commented.

Sargent Shriver, the Corps Director, predicted that the current total of more than 2,000 volunteers in training or overseas would climb to 5,000 by the end of 1962 to meet the mounting requests from the aided countries. The new volunteers will include retired people as well as recent college graduates.

Already, in its first year in the field, the Corps has had teams of American men and women teaching school in the Philippines, surveying roads in Tanganyika, working in clinics in Malaya, and showing farmers how to raise geese on the West Indies island of St. Lucia.

Almost every week this summer and fall, new contingents will head overseas, usually for more language training in the "host country" before they go to work with local people.

A sign tacked on the door of Mr. Shriver's office says: "There is no place on this club for good losers." The Corps Director is pushing his staff hard to keep recruiting, selection, and training of volunteers on schedule.

Plans must be coordinated with the "host" countries (who request and assign the volunteers), the Agency for International Development, and with the colleges and private groups that do the basic training under contract.

The coordination is seldom painless. Each organization and each foreign country has its own notions of how the Peace Corps should be trained or employed.

But so far the buildup has got off to a good start.

Most of the increase will come between now and Labor Day, as the recruits pour into American universities for training. Mr. Shriver expects to have 10,000 volunteers by the fall of 1963.

There will be midwives in Bolivia, tractor operators (replacing Czech technicians) in Tunisia, agricultural extension workers in Chile, fisheries experts in West Africa, and thousands of college graduates of all ages teaching school in a dozen lands.

"All the countries that have thus far received volunteers," Mr. Shriver said, "have asked us to double, triple, and even quadruple the numbers."

In short, the Peace Corps, despite dark fears expressed by congressional critics a year ago, has become a success.

The Corps was first created by President Kennedy's Executive order March 1, 1961, on a "temporary pilot basis" as a branch of the State Department. Congressional approval for a permanent Corps came last summer. Mr. Shriver's mission is to supply volunteers to help the world's underdeveloped nations catch up in education, agriculture, health, and other fields. The first of the 2-year volunteers began training June 26, 1961.

"The payoff is performance overseas," William F. Haddad, an associate director and "inspector general" of the Corps, said.

CONGRESS AUTHORIZES EXPANSION OF CORPS

The organization has had a year's hard-won experience with a \$30 million program, which currently involves 973 volunteers overseas in 16 countries and 1,379 more in training.

It is on the basis of this experience that President Kennedy has asked—and won congressional authorization—for expansion of the Corps to a \$63,750,000 level in the year starting July 1. The Appropriations Committees have yet to match the go-ahead with the actual funds, and no monetary action is expected until late in the congressional session.

From interviews here, and from special reports by correspondents of the New York Times abroad, a picture emerges of the strengths and weaknesses of the Corps performance overseas since the first two groups of volunteers arrived in Tanganyika and Colombia last fall.

The first point that becomes clear is that two problems forecast last year by critics have not cropped up.

These were: That the Corps would become a haven for "beatniks" and "fuzzy-minded idealists" unable to cope with Spartan living and the realities of life in the bush, and that Communist agents would score easy victories in ideological debate with naive volunteers before the impressionable people of the aided countries.

On the contrary, the volunteer who emerges from the Corps training program is not a "beatnik"; if he is an idealist, he is a tough-minded one.

The Corps screening system has resulted in an 18 percent dropout rate among the men and women who actually started training. The training includes language and work instruction for specific projects on American college campuses ranging from Utah State to New York University. Many of the volunteers also go through a tough jungle camp in Puerto Rico. Their average age is 24 years, but seven persons older than 60 have also made the grade.

The Peace Corps volunteers come from every State in the Union, and from Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands and Guam.

So far, Corps headquarters in Washington has received 26,807 applications for duty. About 20,000 of these applicants have taken entrance tests. Of these, 4,000 have started training or are scheduled to start. Two hundred and sixty-seven have been dropped from training for various reasons.

SEVENTY-FIVE DOLLARS A MONTH BANKED FOR EACH VOLUNTEER

Most of the volunteers have had at least a year in college.

They are reimbursed for living expenses at a rate that is intended to make them live like their local counterparts, for example, teachers or farm extension agents. This rate varies from \$60 a month in the Philippines to \$160 in Tanganyika. In addition, each volunteer gets \$75 a month, banked for him by the Corps, which is paid him after his 2-year tour. In every case, the Corps man works where the host country wants to put him.

Dr. George Guthrie, a Pennsylvania State University psychologist, commented as follows on a training group bound for teaching assignments in the Philippines:

"The majority of these people were in the upper half of their class at college. But there aren't many Phi Beta Kappas. Many of their schools had no chapters of Phi Beta Kappa. They aren't Ivy League or beatnik. They come mostly from small schools and small communities. Most of them are from middle class families. More easily than some, they can afford to make the sacrifice."

This portrait does not ring true for every overseas group. The 35 surveyors, engineers, and geologists working in Tanganyika, for example, are far more of a professional type than the Philippine group.

The attitude overseas, once the newness has worn off, can be summed up in these words by Donald Goodyear, of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, who is teaching school in Enugu, Nigeria: "Despite all the glamorous talk and publicity, we have a perfectly straightforward job to do here. We're teachers—just as we would be at schools anywhere."

Premier Khrushchev recently denounced the Peace Corps as "imperialist." Similarly, most local Communist opposition has been limited to words, and it has been ineffectual. The Communist Party in Chile earlier this year, for example, denounced Peace Corps volunteers working in rural education and health as "imperialist agents" and ordered Communist youths to "confront" the volunteers. Nothing happened.

In India's Punjab, 22-year-old Justin R. McLoughlin of Garrettsville, N.Y., recalled that an Indian farmer one day planted a hammer and sickle emblem on the chicken coop that Mr. McLoughlin was helping him build. "I persuaded him to take it down, at least until the coop was finished," the volunteer said.

STUDENTS IN NIGERIA STILL SNIPE AT AMERICANS

In Nigeria, university students still snipe at the Corps' 108 volunteers, who teach in the country's schools. It was in Nigeria that Miss Margery Michelmore, a newly arrived volunteer, created the Corps' one major "incident" last fall by inscribing her adverse impressions of the local scene on a postcard, which was intercepted and made public in the African country.

"I'm convinced," said Dr. Samuel D. Proctor of Norfolk, Va., Corps representative in Nigeria, "that given a few more months, the Nigerian students will discover the Peace Corps volunteers are not here to direct their political thinking. This will reduce some of the tensions."

The Peace Corps effort has shown other strengths and weaknesses. Most of the latter stem from the hasty, experimental nature of the first dozen programs set in motion last year.

All told, only seven volunteers have been shipped home, three of them returned because of health or family reasons. Yet Mr. Shriver has pointed out that "anybody who wants can get out."

The Corps' one overall strength is that the volunteers are making friends for the United States, in places that their parents had never heard of and where few whites have ever set foot. Much of their success is simply a result of their lack of condescension or self-importance. As a result, there has been a lack of serious racial incidents.

In Ghana, for example, the 51 Americans teaching in British-model boarding schools do not drive cars to work. In fact, unlike other non-Africans and more prosperous Ghanaians, they ride packed "mummy lorries"—trucks used as local buses—along dusty country roads in sweltering heat.

At Kotpindas, a village outside Lahore, West Pakistan, James Mackay, of Hornell, N.Y., a Peace Corps volunteer, organized his fellow volunteers and some Pakistani friends to repair a 300-year-old Mogul bridge. The middle-class Pakistanis confessed they had never used shovels, but joined in anyway. A group of villagers came up and asked, "What, no coolies?" Then, seeing the "sahibs" working, they too pitched in with cries of "shabash"—"well done."

A Times correspondent wrote from New Delhi, India:

"The image the Corps men create generally is that of earnest young Americans who know what they are talking about and who are not afraid to get their hands dirty. Most volunteers here are farmers and look it."

As one official said: "Their heart is really in the Indian rural areas."

The real benefits of the volunteers' labor vary widely from country to country. In India, the tiny Peace Corps contingent is swallowed up in the multitudes; in other, smaller nations, the impact is less localized.

In Malaya, for example, Peace Corps nurses are helping to solve one of the biggest problems of the Health Ministry: staffing rural clinics in the "ulu," Malaya's backwoods. The 36 Peace Corps men and women in the team in Malaya have made a dent in several vital areas, including volunteer work in a 2,500-patient leper colony.

In Tanganyika, the 36 American surveyors, geologists, and engineers are not only creating good will, but, alongside local helpers, are doing a job that a local official described as absolutely vital. They are working on surveying the country, and developing farm-to-market roads to open up isolated hamlets, thus enabling farmers to sell their produce at good prices.

The volunteers dismissed the old British notion that Africans would not work. On safari, when their African helper sat down, saying he could not go on, Thomas Katus, of McIntosh, S. Dak., and Jerry Parsons, of Albany, N.Y., sat down too. "OK," they told their friend. "It's your country, so why should we bother." This got the team going again.

Prime Minister Rashidi Kawawa, of Tanganyika, paid this tribute to the volunteers: "They have done a very good job, mixing with the people and encouraging self-help measures. We hope to get more of them."

Teaching is the biggest single specialty in which the Peace Corps is engaged. In Ghana, Nigeria, and Jamaica, the volunteers are especially welcome, if only because their services are relatively cheap or even free. In many cases, the volunteers serve where local teachers do not want to go.

Another major effort has been in agriculture.

In Brazil, 43 volunteers drove jeeps into the field last month to work with the Brazilian Association for Rural Credit & Assistance on farm assistance and home economics through the local version of the 4-H Clubs.

The Peace Corps in Brazil is dovetailing its work, particularly in the country's poverty-stricken northeast, with the Agency for International Development, which finances the \$2 million project of the rural aid association.

In Colombia, the Peace Corps has attempted one of its more ambitious assignments. Something called "community development."

Although the 62 men volunteers who arrived in Colombia last September have built roads and schools, set up health stations and patched up first-aid cases, their basic function has been to work with Colombian representatives to get mountain villagers to help themselves despite poverty, illiteracy, and the paternalism of the landlords. The task has not been an easy one.

PRIEST LINKS SUCCESS WITH ECONOMIC FREEDOM

In Santander, Colombia, a volunteer told a village priest:

"We want to solve these problems without giving orders. We want to motivate people to work. Maybe we'll build a health center or a road, and then, when we leave, they'll tell themselves 'we need a school,' and they'll shout and argue and laugh and finally build a school."

The priest replied quietly: "You will achieve that when you have economic freedom here." By this he meant freedom from malnutrition, illiteracy, and the lack of opportunity for sharecroppers.

In Chitareaque, in the Colombian department of Boyacá, a hard-working Peace

Corps team was pulled out 3 months ago to avoid its getting into a local dispute over land reform with hostile landowners, who discouraged peasants from attending community meetings.

Nevertheless, the volunteers have made do. One volunteer, Davis Grubb of Westport, Conn., took a bus into Bogotá, called on the Minister of Public Works and came back with a bulldozer, which his village used to build an 8-mile road to market.

Another volunteer, David Downing of Los Gatos, Calif., got a course in midwifery going and prevailed on his friends back home in California to send him midwifery kits.

The villagers are enthusiastic, if every harassed Colombian official is not. The volunteers, sometimes to their annoyance, are besieged with offers of coffee, liquor, or sweets.

So far, the morale of the volunteers is high. But some of them get depressed. "Maybe frustration is built within the boys themselves," said Leon Lane, deputy representative for CARE, Inc. (Cooperative for American Relief Everywhere), which is handling the project for the Corps in Colombia. "They've got 2 years and they want to go too fast too soon. A job like this isn't going to be completed for years and years."

In Chile, 45 men and women trained at the University of Notre Dame and local centers have been in the field since December with the long-established Institute of Rural Education. They are scattered in ones and twos for 1,000 miles in the Chilean interior. Their work is more formalized and more specialized than that of the Colombian team. They work as carpenters, social workers, in rural husbandry, as dental assistants, home economists, nurses, homebuilders.

"These Peace Corps volunteers are striving for a better understanding between peoples," the Chilean newspaper *La Estrella* said.

More volunteers are on the way to Chile. But, as in the case of Colombia, the impact of the Americans is muted by the vastness of the problems they have tackled.

Despite such frustrations, both Latin American officials and the Peace Corps see rural development as a way to make good use of young Americans with or without special talents. Several hundred counterparts of the volunteers in Colombia and Chile are being picked for work in Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, Cyprus, British North Borneo, and Sarawak.

Besides the occasional frustrations, the Peace Corps has had other problems. One of the most severe was the lack of proper language instruction—a fault that has been corrected.

For example, the first group of 128 volunteers sent to the Philippines last fall spent weeks learning Tagalog, the national language. Then they were assigned to non-Tagalog-speaking areas. Roughly the same mistake was made in training the 28 volunteers sent to West Pakistan, where the state languages, along with English, are Sindhi, Punjabi, and Pushto. The 26 men and women sent to India's Punjab just could not master Punjabi in 10 weeks at Ohio State University.

SOME OF THE PROJECTS POORLY DEFINED AT FIRST

A second problem has been projects that were either poorly handled or badly defined at first. Roger Ernst, of New York, former Corps representative in New Delhi, commented that all the volunteers sent to India should have been assigned to a single endeavor, such as agricultural work, instead of being scattered in a variety of jobs. In both India and West Pakistan, local officials were initially not quite sure what to do with the volunteers.

In the Philippines, the 128 volunteers were assigned as teachers' helpers. This aroused

suspensions of local teachers that the Americans had been sent to spy on them and complaints by the volunteers that they had not been given enough work to do. In Pakistan, India, and Nigeria some unhappy volunteers were assigned initially to office jobs instead of getting out in the field.

Yet, even where the official assignments were unsatisfactory, the volunteers, with Mr. Shriver's blessing, launched a host of extra-curricular projects on their own. Examples:

In the Philippines, 16 volunteers organized a month-long summer "camp brotherhood" at Mambucal, on the island of Negros, for 600 indigent boys. Others set up "little theater" groups, conducted demonstration courses on the use of fertilizer and ran summer schools.

In Ghana, as in other countries, the volunteers have been writing home to schools and civic organizations asking for books, and have opened their public libraries in their own cramped quarters.

In East Pakistan, Robert W. Taylor, of Los Gatos, Calif., invented a machine to parboil rice cheaply and efficiently, using the rice husks themselves as fuel, of which there is a critical local shortage.

In doing their varied assignments and carrying out their self-made projects, the Peace Corps volunteers have experienced few serious health problems. Three Corps volunteers have died—two in an airplane crash in Colombia and one under surgery in Manila.

ONE PEACE CORPS BABY IS BORN IN NIGERIA

On the happier side, there have been about 20 Peace Corps marriages—either between volunteers or between a volunteer and a citizen of the aided country. So far, all the newlyweds have continued their duties. The first Peace Corps baby was born May 16 to a young volunteer couple teaching school in Nigeria.

That the Corps' problems have not been more serious is attributed here to several things, besides the hard work and the quality of the volunteers themselves.

The first is Mr. Shriver's determination not to make a bureaucracy of the Peace Corps, but to keep all hands giving top priority to people, rather than "policy" and "procedure."

The second is the work of the "inspector general" system, which provides for frequent flying trips to hear the volunteers' complaints. The language problem was unearthed early in this fashion.

"The volunteers have a very definite idea about how the Corps should be run. They won't take any second-rate stuff. They keep us on our toes," an aid to Mr. Haddad said.

The greatest danger, as the Corps grows, according to officials here, will be that it might lose its lively nonbureaucratic spirit. The jargon of the social scientist and bureaucrat—volunteers are "object-oriented" for example—is already creeping into ordinary speech at the Corps' busy headquarters here at 806 Connecticut Avenue, across Lafayette Square from the White House.

On the other hand, as President Kennedy told the Corps staff here last week:

"You have brought to Government service a sense of morale and a sense of enthusiasm and real commitment which has been absent from too many governmental agencies for too many years."

This summer, the Corps' recruiting and selection of qualified people to go overseas will continue to pose headaches as commitments increase. Some teams of volunteers will go overseas under their prescribed strength, especially where certain key skills cannot be obtained. But it is expected that, in the main, the commitments will be met.

WHERE VOLUNTEERS SERVE

WASHINGTON, June 24.—The following lists the Peace Corps projects underway and planned, including the countries aided, the

number of volunteers on duty or assigned, the projects and training centers:

PROJECTS UNDERWAY

Ghana, 51; teaching, secondary education, University of California (Berkeley).
 Nigeria, 40; secondary education, Harvard.
 Nigeria, 45; secondary education, University of California at Los Angeles.
 Nigeria, 24; university education, Michigan State.
 Sierra Leone, 37; secondary education, Columbia.
 Tanganyika, 35; road surveying, mapping, Texas Western.
 Colombia, 58; rural development, Rutgers.
 Colombia, 44; rural development, Arizona State.
 Chile, 45; rural development, Notre Dame.
 St. Lucia, 15; agriculture extension, education, Iowa State.
 Philippines, 272; primary education, Pennsylvania State.
 Malaya, 67; rural development, health, education, Northern Illinois University.
 India, 26; agriculture extension, industrial education, Ohio State.
 Pakistan: East, 29; agriculture extension, health, education, Experiment in International Living (Putnam, Vt.). West, 28; agriculture extension, health, education, Colorado State.
 Thailand, 45; university education, malaria eradication, University of Michigan.
 Brazil, 43; 4-H, 4-H Foundation.
 El Salvador, 25; agricultural extension, home economics, rural development, New Mexico State.
 Venezuela, 5; university teachers, Experiment in International Living.
 Jamaica, 39; vocational education, Research Institute for Study of Man (New York).

PROJECTS PLANNED

Afghanistan, 13, teachers, mechanics, Georgetown.
 Nepal, 69; education, agriculture extension, George Washington.
 Venezuela, 41; 4-H, 4-H Foundation.
 Venezuela, 18; YMCA, Experiment in International Living.
 Iran, 48; education agriculture, Utah State.
 Chile, 20; YWCA, Experiment in International Living.
 Ecuador, 74; community development, Inter-American University (Puerto Rico).
 Peru, 90; community development cooperative credit, Cornell.
 Peru, 27; community development, Catholic University (Puerto Rico).
 Peru, 53; nutrition, Catholic University (Puerto Rico).
 Dominican Republic, 21; rural development, University of Puerto Rico.
 Bolivia, 46; health and sanitation, University of Oklahoma.
 Ceylon, 53; teaching, University of Pennsylvania.
 Philippines, 82; science, mathematics—University, San Francisco State.
 Tunisia, 78; multipurpose, Indiana University.
 Somalia, 48; teaching, New York University.
 Honduras, 28; social welfare, St. Louis University.
 Sierra Leone, 70; teaching, New York State College.
 Liberia, 100; secondary and rural education, University of Pittsburgh.
 North Borneo/Sarawak, 14; health, University of Hawaii.
 North Borneo/Sarawak, 56; rural development, University of Hawaii.
 North Borneo/Sarawak, 31; teaching, University of Hawaii.
 Thailand, 64; health, education, University of Michigan.
 Ghana, 115; teaching, Berkeley.
 Philippines, 200; teaching, San Jose State.
 Ivory Coast, 45; education, University of Wisconsin.

Niger, 8; teaching, Howard University.
 Senegal, 6; teaching, Howard University.
 Togo, 20; education, University of Maryland.

THE PEACE CORPS' FIRST YEAR

A year ago tomorrow the first of the 2-year recruits for the Peace Corps began their training. Some critics of this plan for a kind of civilian AEF feared that young idealists with weak characters, unfounded illusions and beards might be attracted. But beatniks got no welcome. The 1,000th trained volunteer will soon go overseas. Performance reports are good enough to justify Director Shriver in planning to have 10,000 Peace Corps recruits abroad by the fall of 1963. Some of these facts are set forth in a news report in the Times today.

The training at home has been rigorous; in the field the young people have been expected to live as do their native counterparts, often on a fairly Spartan regime; it is the host country and not Washington that decides what shall be done where; and hard work rather than glamour has been the key expression. Applicants were carefully screened, with the result that only a few wanted to come home prematurely, or had to be asked to do so.

Last year the Peace Corps made out with \$30 million. This year about twice this amount has been authorized, though not yet appropriated. The larger amount would be a good investment. One can hardly think of a better way of making friends, spreading democratic ideas and helping people. Some day the Nigerians, the East Indians or the Colombians may reciprocate by sending their own young people to work with us on projects they can handle better than we can. Why not?

MIGRATORY LABOR

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, some of the Nation's most powerful farm interests have launched a massive and deliberate campaign of half-truths and distorted facts aimed at arousing the entire farming community against one of the most important and needed migratory bills now before the Congress.

The facts suggest that behind this attack are a small number of growers who are the major users of Mexican farm labor supplied through the bracero program under Public Law 78. These growers, along with policymakers in a few farm associations use paid lobbyists in Washington to campaign against S. 1129, a legislative measure to provide farmers a reliable, qualified domestic labor supply and make fuller employment possible for qualified American farmworkers. Worth reiterating, however, is that fact that not all farm associations or lobbyists oppose S. 1129; many have worked hard to assure that the employment service procedures under S. 1129 will be available to farmer and farmworker alike.

Doom-filled prophecies and distorted logic make up the syntax of the assault upon S. 1129. In a story as imaginative as "Little Red Riding Hood," farmers are aroused about an imagined agricultural welfare state in which the Secretary of Labor will act as an ally of union organizers to bludgeon farmers. The National Farm Labor Users Committee of El Paso, Tex., has distributed a document consisting of a 3-page fact sheet, 6 pages of suggested news releases, 7 pages of suggested editorials, and a suggested 5-

page speech. The document is full of stratagems which exemplify the techniques by which the powerful few rule the many weak. This document states in part:

You are aware of the danger to agriculture posed by S. 1129, the proposal in Congress by Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, of New Jersey, to turn over control of the domestic farm labor force to the U.S. Department of Labor.

The enclosed material has been prepared for your use. * * * As you will see, this consists of suggested news releases, editorials, speeches, radio and television releases, and a general fact sheet.

To be most effective, this material should be localized so as to make it more attractive to the various news media in your area. As a consequence, we would suggest the following:

Do not simply reproduce and mail this material to your local news outlets. Instead (a), wherever possible, substitute the name of a local association and individual for the name of the national users committee and its spokesman; (b) have some well-known individual in your organization who is familiar with the issues hand-carry your revised release and suggested editorial material to your local news media. Have him present it to the editor as being of vital concern to the entire community, and, therefore, of significant news interest; and (c) if you have additional material which you would like to include in the localized material you give to your local news media, fine.

See to it that prominent members of your organization personally present your localized story to their service clubs, church groups, influential representatives of allied industries, and your elected State and Federal representatives.

Fear resulting from such distortions and techniques is as unnecessary as it is avoidable—especially when the fear is manufactured by those holding themselves out as having the only antidote to allay these fears. In short, I am charging these few paid Washington lobbyists with being self-proclaimed protectorates and then generating fear among the farmers to entrench themselves as the bastions against an imagined enemy-Congress.

AN UNPARALLELED GRANT OF POWER TO GOLDBERG A FALSE CHARGE

Another document spuriously charges that S. 1129 grants the Secretary of Labor an "unparalleled grant of broad discretionary power" and cites sections 204(b), 205(2) and 206(a) as proof. Examination of this so-called proof, however, shows it to be without merit in that these sections of S. 1129 have parallel provisions in existing law, or implementing regulations and agreements.

Fiction: Section 204(b) is an unparalleled grant of power.

Fact: This section of S. 1129 is similar to section 503 of Public Law 78—1951—and regulation 602.10 of the Wagner-Peyser Act—1933—both of which provide that foreign workers will not be available to farmers who have not made reasonable efforts to obtain domestic farmworkers.

Fiction: Section 205(2) is an unparalleled grant of power.

Fact: This section of S. 1129 is similar to regulation 602(9) of Wagner-Peyser which conditions the interstate recruitment of American farmworkers upon as-

surances that local workers are not available.

Fiction: Section 206(a) is an unparalleled grant of power.

Fact: This section of S. 1129 is similar to article 15 of the 1951 labor agreement under Public Law 78 which authorizes the Secretary to determine the prevailing wage to be paid Mexican farmworkers.

MISLEADING STATEMENT ABOUT HOUSING STANDARDS UNDER S. 1129

This document also asserts:

Housing provided farmworkers under the S. 1129 employment service must conform to standards * * * irrespective of * * * State law.

The assertion is in direct conflict with the language of S. 1129; section 205(a) (5) of S. 1129 does not contain the statement, "irrespective of State law." Moreover, the Secretary of Labor has indicated that an adequate housing code will be considered a legitimate standard.

INNUENDOS ARE COMMONPLACE

The document distributed by the National Farm Labor Users Committee of El Paso, Tex., asserts that—

in testifying for (S. 1129), the Secretary declared "I do not want any extraordinary dictatorial powers." Are we to assume—

The document continues—

then, that he would be satisfied with ordinary dictatorial powers?

Taking a statement out of context is not a legitimate mode of persuasion—it is pure flubdubbery. Overlooked or ignored in the hearing record on S. 1129 was this meaningful discussion:

Senator BURDICK. Do you feel that section 204 or 206 grants you any extraordinary or dictatorial powers?

Secretary GOLDBERG. I do not.

No clearer disclaimer seems possible; clearly, Secretary Goldberg will not be granted any dictatorial powers, ordinary or extraordinary. Moreover, our system of Government would not permit such power to be vested in any individual.

THE OPPOSITION, THE ANOMALY, AND UNFAIR COMPETITION

Absent from the recent assault against S. 1129 is a discussion of the smoothly functioning bracero program under Public Law 78, a program almost identical to S. 1129, except that the latter involves American farmworkers rather than Mexican farmworkers. While severe underemployment among domestic farmworkers plagued this Nation, as many as 450,000 Mexican braceros were imported in a single year to work our Nation's farms. Oddly enough, however, the farm associations did not contend that the bracero program would ensnarl the entire farming community in a "Federal bureaucracy" or an "agricultural welfare state," the slogans used to discredit S. 1129.

"A czar," that is the derogatory term applied to the Secretary of Labor who will assist American farmers obtain qualified American farmworkers. While he assists farmers obtain Mexican farmworkers under the bracero program, however, no such term is applied to the Secretary. Since the Secretary of Labor is the same person and will administer

similar employment service provisions, to call him a czar only when he administers S. 1129 is a pristine example of doublethink.

Key to the anomalous position taken by those attacking S. 1129 lies in the fact that these associations do not truly represent the entire farming community as claimed. Accustomed to economic benefits gained through the bracero program, a few growers seek to retain this advantage at the expense of the small farmer.

Seriously disadvantaged from an economic viewpoint is the small farmer who is not equipped to utilize Mexican farmworkers supplied under the bracero program. He must rely upon his own efforts and ingenuity to attract qualified reliable farmworkers to harvest his crops. Too often, however, enough farmworkers cannot be obtained when needed or they may not be qualified or reliable. Meanwhile, the large commercial farming operations participating in the bracero program are able to obtain a sufficient number of reliable farmworkers. These workers, carefully selected and transported under a highly efficient program, will arrive when needed and will be qualified and productive.

The large bracero user, moreover, receives an additional economic advantage over the nonbracero user. Federal funds, raised through taxes, are used to pay part of the costs of operating the bracero program. In this connection, it is noteworthy that the farmers in Texas and California alone utilize 75 percent of the annual importation of braceros.

Also victimized by the assault on S. 1129 are the long-suffering domestic farmworker and his family. The loss of an adequate, well-functioning, and voluntary farm employment service envisioned under S. 1129 would perpetuate the existing barriers against matching farmworkers to farm jobs. To leave such employment problems to chance is irrational and imposes an unnecessary burden upon the farmer and the citizen farmworker alike.

Moreover, the importation of hundreds of thousands of Mexican farmworkers puts them into direct job competition with our already underemployed rural citizen farmworkers. Originally the bracero program was enacted as a stop-gap measure. Over the years, however, it has become the major source of seasonal farmworkers. It is now time for the American public, farmer, and non-farmer alike, to modify the bracero program so that it is used to supplement—but not supplant—the American farm labor force.

DELUSION ENTAILS SELF-DELUSION

The growers seeking to discredit and abort the possibility of a stable, productive domestic farm labor force are deluding themselves. The extension of the bracero program in Congress in 1961 was accomplished only by great pressure. Furthermore, when President Kennedy signed the 2-year extension, he said:

The adverse effect of the Mexican farm labor program * * * on the wage and employment conditions of domestic workers is clear and cumulative in its impact. We do

not condone it. Therefore, I sign this bill with the assurance that the Secretary of Labor will * * * use the authority vested in him under the law to * * * make the determinations essential for the protection of the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers.

Given the uncertain future of the bracero program, it is absurd for the large bracero user to block the passage of S. 1129. To accomplish this end is tantamount to destroying one of the most useful and needed pieces of legislation ever designed to provide farmers, large or small, with an increased number of qualified, reliable seasonal farmworkers.

A MODEST PROPOSAL TO REASONABLE MEN

Once it is clear that the attack on S. 1129 is being undertaken only for the benefit of a small number of large bracero users, and on an accurate appraisal, not even in the best interests of these growers themselves, rational farmers who will benefit from the proposed voluntary employment service envisioned under S. 1129 should carefully examine S. 1129 and the benefits it will provide. This is a modest proposal to reasonable men.

To assist the farming community in this task, I have prepared a fact sheet which will provide an accurate analysis and explanation of S. 1129. I hope the farming community will make use of this fact sheet; I also hope those representing the farmers will read it with a view toward assisting the farmer, the migrant farm family, and the national interest. Once this is underway, and some of the wrong-headed slogans and mythology are replaced by rational discussion, I will welcome ideas for making the employment services provided under S. 1129 as effective and helpful as possible to farmers and farmworkers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the fact sheet to which I referred, containing the true purposes of S. 1129, together with a description of the bill and how it would operate, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the fact sheet was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FACT SHEET ON S. 1129, TO AMEND THE ACT OF JUNE 6, 1933, AS AMENDED, TO AUTHORIZE THE SECRETARY OF LABOR TO PROVIDE IMPROVED PROGRAMS OF RECRUITMENT, TRANSPORTATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS IN THE UNITED STATES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

(The statements in this fact sheet are based on the version of the bill, S. 1129, on which hearings were held by the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor on February 8 and 9, 1962, and on consultation with the U.S. Department of Labor concerning the prospective operation of the program.)

1. What is the purpose of S. 1129?

S. 1129 is designed to remedy inadequacies that exist in the present farm labor situation from the viewpoint of both farm employers and farmworkers. Many farmers cannot now obtain adequate numbers of seasonal farmworkers. Many more cannot rely on the workers (1) to arrive when they are needed, (2) to have the appropriate qualifications, and (3) to stay on the job until its completion.

For these farmers, S. 1129 is intended to make available an assured, reliable labor force. S. 1129 will also make fuller employment possible for qualified farmworkers and,

by providing workers placed under the program with certain minimum assurances, will increase the number of qualified, reliable workers in the farm labor force.

2. How will S. 1129 affect the present farm placement system?

Use of the placement program provided by S. 1129 will be voluntary for both farmers and workers. The program will supplement the present Federal-State placement system; it will not replace present procedures. For the farmer, the voluntary nature of the S. 1129 program means (1) he will be free to use the program or not, as he sees fit, in filling his domestic labor needs. It will be for the farmer alone to determine whether he prefers to rely on existing governmental or private procedures for this purpose; (2) he may choose to obtain a part of his work force through the S. 1129 program and the remainder by existing methods.

3. How will the farmer be assured of getting only qualified, willing, and able workers under S. 1129?

Through a process of careful screening, in which the farmer will have the right to participate, if he wishes to do so, from the beginning. Each worker hired will enter into an employment contract in which he promises to perform the work required of him with proper application, care, and diligence.

Effort will be made to enable farmers who have obtained satisfactory workers under S. 1129 to reemploy the same workers in subsequent seasons.

4. Where will the workers supplied under the S. 1129 program come from?

Under the authority given in S. 1129 for positive recruitment, it will be possible for the employment service to tap new sources of agricultural labor in addition to making referrals of workers who, through crew leaders, or otherwise, now find their way to farm placement offices. Seasonal farm employment away from home would be profitable for many farmworkers and small family farmers who now lack year-round work. Recent surveys, made in rural Mississippi and Arkansas, strongly indicate that this will be an important source of qualified workers for the S. 1129 program. Another source will be American Indians, among whom there is extensive unemployment although they often are skilled and reliable farm employees. Still other workers recruited under S. 1129 will be persons who have acquired special skills in training programs such as the Area Redevelopment Administration program in Hammonont, N.J., which recently graduated 20 new farm tractor and machine operators.

In addition to making farmworkers available from new sources, S. 1129 will increase the total number of available man-hours through fuller employment of workers already in the migratory stream. Many present migrants, reluctant to travel until they know that work is available, now frequently delay their departures so long that they do not arrive in harvest areas until the peak need has passed. Other migrants now seek work without guidance, or travel unnecessarily long distances to obtain employment. By assuring transportation to the work and back to the home base, and by making possible the most effective use of information on the locations of men and jobs, S. 1129 will promote the full utilization of workers such as these.

5. What will it cost the farmer to obtain workers under the S. 1129 program?

For each job filled, the farmer will pay a fee of no more than \$15. This fee will be the Government's reimbursement for the costs of the following functions, which S. 1129 authorizes the Secretary of Labor to perform (1) transporting the workers from the area of recruitment to an area of employment, and return; and (2) providing necessary subsistence, housing, and emergency medical care for workers and their families during transportation and while

arrangements are being made for their employment in or their departure from an area of employment.

Should a worker hired under S. 1129 fail, without good cause, to fulfill his employment contract, the farmer will be supplied a replacement worker at no charge. If the farmer does not desire a replacement, a proportional part of his original fee will be refunded. As a result of these replacement and refund provisions in the bill, it will be the Government, not the grower, that bears the risk of any loss of transportation expenses through a worker's leaving the job before the end of the agreed-upon period of employment.

6. What are the obligations of a farmer to a worker he obtains under S. 1129?

As is now required with respect to housing for workers referred by the U.S. Employment Service through interstate clearance, the employer's housing for workers referred under S. 1129 will have to meet minimum standards. Where there are effective State housing regulations, however, additional requirements will not be imposed.

The employer's other obligations will be: to pay the worker as much as local workers receive for similar work; to pay him at least every 2 weeks; to promise him the equivalent of full-time employment during the agreed-upon work period; and to furnish him with workmen's compensation or comparable insurance coverage.

In the event, of course, that a worker breaches the employment agreement, the employer's obligations under the agreement will terminate.

7. Will workers placed in jobs under S. 1129 be accompanied by their families?

They may be when it is feasible in the general circumstances and the available housing is adequate to accommodate families.

8. How will a farmer go about hiring workers under the S. 1129 program?

Orders for workers under S. 1129, like orders under present placement procedures, will be placed through the local office of the employment service. Workers will be brought into the area under S. 1129 only if sufficient qualified workers who are permanent residents of the area are unavailable.

The transportation of workers by the Secretary of Labor will terminate at a distribution center in the area of employment. These centers will be located in the areas of heaviest demand for agricultural workers. Tentative plans call for distribution centers in Florida, California, Indiana, Texas, and Virginia, and in addition, for several overnight rest stops for migrants which can be used as supplementary distribution centers.

From the distribution center to the farm where S. 1129 workers are to be employed, transportation will be the farmer's responsibility. Accordingly, the practical availability of workers under the program will depend on the existence of a center within a reasonable distance of the farmer's property.

9. What happens when the harvest is completed?

To the extent that crop cycles permit, workers will be scheduled for continuous employment in a series of jobs. Consecutive jobs in the vicinity of a single distribution center will be scheduled where possible. In its emphasis on preseason scheduling, the S. 1129 program will be comparable to the employment service's annual worker plan.

When workers have completed their employment on one farm, the grower will be responsible for returning them to the nearest distribution center, or, if the next job is closer than the distribution center, he may take them there instead. When all scheduled jobs in the area are finished, the workers will be transported to a new area of employment. After all seasonal work away from home has ended, the workers will be returned to the area in which they were recruited.

10. What will be the relationship between S. 1129 and present programs for the temporary importation of foreign farm labor?

With the enactment of S. 1129, farmers will have a new procedure for recruitment of domestic workers. In appropriate circumstances, the use of this procedure would be considered one of the reasonable efforts to attract domestic workers that must be made before a need for foreign workers can be certified. The availability of the S. 1129 procedure will not, however, increase the time required to process requests for foreign worker certifications.

It is to be expected that the S. 1129 program will result in the replacement of some foreign workers by domestics. The domestic workers, of course, receiving assurances concerning their employment somewhat less extensive than those required for foreign workers, will cost no more than foreign workers for farmers to employ.

The decline in the number of foreign workers certified will be limited, however, by the extent to which S. 1129 increases the number of qualified domestic workers available. In other words, there will be a reduction only where (1) the number of qualified, reliable domestic workers that can be made available with the aid of S. 1129 is larger than the number the farmer has previously been able to obtain; and (2) suitable housing for the S. 1129 workers is available.

Where growers have housing facilities only for bachelors, the S. 1129 program, to affect the use of foreign workers, will in general have to provide bachelor domestics. No expensive housing modifications to accommodate families will be required. If the S. 1129 program can provide only family groups, the number of foreign workers may be reduced where on- or off-farm family housing can be furnished without any unreasonable burden on the farm operator. A reduction in the size of a grower's labor force, for example, may mean that his bachelor housing, with slight modifications, could accommodate a labor force including families.

11. Does S. 1129 provide for the unionization of farm workers?

No. The bill makes no change in existing law and regulations, either to promote or to discourage union organization. S. 1129 simply continues in effect the present rule, applicable to both the U.S. Employment Service and the State agencies, that a worker will not be referred to aid in filling a job which is vacant because of a labor dispute or the filling of which is an issue in a labor dispute.

OUR 1962 THOREAU CENTENARY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Henry David Thoreau, who died a century ago this year, has become recognized as one of our great Americans—writer, walker, philosopher, moralist, poet-naturalist, conservationist, leader in wildlife protection and wilderness preservation. He studied most how best to live in our American environment. His findings, as set forth in his writings and shown in his living, have seemed more and more pertinent to his successors. We do well to honor him.

One of the most fitting of the observances that have taken place this centenary year was held here in Washington, D.C., on May 11, 1962, when the Secretary of the Interior and the executive secretary of the Wilderness Society joined in sponsoring on the grounds of Dumbarton Oaks an outdoor gathering that heard remarks made by a great poet and an Associate Judge of our Supreme Court.

That morning the Washington Post set the tone of the day in the Nation's Capital with an editorial entitled "Immortal Yankee," pointing out among other comments that—

The most fitting memorial to Thoreau on the centenary of his death would be the passage in Congress of the wilderness bill, designed to keep some of our land forever wild as a national treasure.

The Public Lands Subcommittee of the House of Representatives Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was that afternoon concluding hearings on the measure to which the Washington Post referred. That was the wilderness bill, S. 174, passed last September 6, 1961, by the Senate with a vote of 78 to 8 and now pending in the House of Representatives with the urgent endorsement of the President.

It is a wise comment of the Washington Post that enactment of this wilderness legislation can be viewed as a "most fitting memorial to Thoreau on the centenary of his death."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial "Immortal Yankee" from the May 11, 1962, issue of the Washington Post be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, for the great benefits that can be afforded us as we move forward with our responsibilities here in the Congress, and for the inspiration to be communicated to our fellow citizens I should like to make a matter of record the remarks at the Dumbarton Oaks gathering.

The meeting was opened by Howard Zahniser, executive secretary of the Wilderness Society and editor of the Living Wilderness. Dr. Zahniser, who also is a past president of the Thoreau Society, presented Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall as the occasion's master of ceremonies. Secretary Udall introduced our great poet, Robert Frost, and Associate Justice William O. Douglas, who were the speakers for observance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the remarks made at this centenary observance of the death of Henry David Thoreau be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks along with accounts of the gathering as reported in both the Washington Star and the Washington Post on May 12, 1962.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibits 2, 3, and 4.)

I also invite the attention of Senators to the fact that the commemoration of the centennial of Henry David Thoreau reminds us of some unfinished business in the Congress. The unfinished business is referred to in yesterday's Washington Daily News. The article is entitled "Unfinished Business: The Wilderness Bill." The editorial states:

The wilderness bill is designed to preserve in its primitive state some 35 million acres of American scenic grandeur.

Against the carefully and conscientiously drawn Senate bill the arguments of those with a commercial ax to grind weigh light on the scales of public interest, which clearly requires that America's dwindling heritage of wilderness grandeur be preserved to inspire and instruct future generations.

I compliment the Washington Daily News editorial staff for the excellent editorial, because it is in the public interest and it is a great public service. My colleagues know that for many years I have been associated with an effort in the Congress to protect the great, fine, and vast areas of wilderness territory so that future generations might experience some of the wholesome recreation which is made available because of those public lands. We are deeply indebted to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] for his work in the field and for piloting the measure through the Senate, as well as to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], who was the Senator in charge of the bill when the measure was passed by the Senate.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, May 11, 1962]

IMMORTAL YANKEE

The man was impossible, his ideas eccentric, and his career by every conventional standard a failure. He was a writer, but he published only two books and a few magazine articles during his lifetime. Nobody read them. Indeed, when New England flowered, Henry David Thoreau seemed to his contemporaries a species of crabgrass—a pawky hermit who seemed as indifferent to society's opinion as mankind was indifferent to him.

But from the time of his death on May 6, 1862, the world's respect for Thoreau has steadily increased and it is wholly appropriate that his memory will be honored today at Dumbarton Oaks. Thoreau speaks to both the private and public man, and to both he has something replenishing to say. Curiously, Thoreau's ideas seem more relevant to our world today than they were in his own time, when it was relatively so much easier to put his principles into practice.

In 1845 he went to live at Walden Pond, "to live deep and suck out the marrow of life," and his experiment in solitude yielded a classic statement on the importance of escaping the clutter of civilization. The clutter has spread with awesome speed and threatens to swallow up the remaining wilderness—as it has Walden Pond itself. The most fitting memorial to Thoreau on the centenary of his death would be the passage in Congress of the wilderness bill, designed to keep some of our land forever wild as a national treasure.

To the public man, Thoreau speaks in demanding accents. In 1849, not long after Marx and Engels published the "Communist Manifesto," Thoreau wrote "Civil Disobedience" a textbook for a different kind of revolt. Thoreau spent a night in jail rather than pay a petty tax to a state then engaged in the Mexican War. His essay sought to justify his defiance by appealing to a higher law beyond government.

Manifestly, no rational society could be organized along the principles of Thoreau. But a humane society cannot exist if it wholly lacks those principles. Occasions arise when only civil disobedience can serve as a remedy for wrong. Gandhi, when he was a lawyer in South Africa, read both Thoreau and Tolstol, and from their writings derived the tactics of passive resistance that brought an end to imperial rule in India with a minimum of bitterness.

By a circular process, Gandhi's ideas returned to the United States and are used by southern Negroes and white freedom riders to eliminate the humiliations of second-class citizenship. The philosophy of their defiance springs not from Marx but from Thoreau, whose appeal is to the conscience of men and not to their stomachs. The spirit of Thoreau is very much alive in a country he would otherwise scarcely recognize.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Washington Post, May 12, 1962]

THOREAU'S DEATH MARKED IN WOODS

(By Dorothy Butler)

A group of eminent American Americans went to the green woods yesterday to pay tribute to a simple lover of nature.

"This is a place Thoreau would have loved. It's just like a picnic place," Robert Frost said to Louis Untermeyer as they strode along a birch-shaded stretch of path in Dumbarton Oaks Park.

Earlier, Untermeyer had whispered: "I think Thoreau would have been a bit staggered by the beauty and magnificence of it."

The occasion was a ceremony marking the death of Thoreau in his Concord home a hundred years ago this week.

The ceremony was a project of Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall and the Wilderness Society of Washington.

Frost told some 100 persons gathered in the park's woodland meadow:

"Whenever I'm weary of considering, and I can stand things no longer, I always say: Give me the woods, I've always wanted to be * * * lost in the woods."

He called Thoreau's slim volume, "Walden," one of America's greatest storybooks. "It has everything," he said.

Another Thoreauvian, Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas brought along Chief Justice of the United States Earl Warren.

Thoreau, who built himself a hut in the woods and lived happily in it on a weekly budget of 27 cents, would be "alarmed at America's present trend toward conformity," said the Justice. He did not think like the crowd * * * But he knew the quiet desperation in which most people live their lives."

But despite Thoreau's frequent preachments of the virtue of ridding one's life of complexities, he would have been "flattered," that the "great of the Nation" had penetrated the woods to honor his memory, said Untermeyer, consultant-in-poetry at the Library of Congress.

"You see, he was kind of an off-stage statesman," he said.

EXHIBIT 3

[From the Washington Evening Star, May 12, 1962]

THOREAU CENTENNIAL NOTED AT DUMBARTON OAKS GROVE

(By Janet Koltun)

You'll not meet a more devoted clan than lovers of the American philosopher, Henry David Thoreau, who call themselves "Thoreauvians," and sometimes "Thor-OY-ans."

But the Thors are sophisticated in their hero worship. You won't catch a one of them wearing a sweatshirt emblazoned with the mug of their hero, as do Beethoven lovers.

There wasn't a sweatshirt in evidence, only proper business garb, as 60 Government officials, diplomats, and at least two poets hied into Dumbarton Oaks Park yesterday to celebrate the centennial of the burial of Thoreau, who preferred solitude to congregations.

Displaying a true Thor esprit de corps, many dignitaries hiked the half mile into the park, including Nicaraguan Ambassador Guillermo Sevilla-Sacasa.

Interior Secretary Udall and Poet Robert Frost fudged a bit on the Thor tradition. They rode in Mr. Udall's limousine part of the way, then walked the rest. Chief Justice Warren and Justice Douglas elected to ride into the glen.

TRIBUTE READ

Secretary Udall read a tribute to Thoreau and the Wilderness Society secretary, Howard Zahniser, noted that Thoreau advocated primitive forest areas around every town. He suggested that Thoreau also advocated committees to look after the wilderness.

Mr. Zahniser and Mr. Udall differed on what to call themselves. Mr. Zahniser pronounced it "Thor-OH-vians," while it came from Mr. Udall's western tongue as "Thor-OY-ans."

Introduced by Mr. Zahniser as "captain of our huckleberry party," Secretary Udall in turn introduced Poet Bill Meredith of New London, Conn. He read at the Library of Congress last year and suggested the gathering.

Another poet, Mr. Frost, told the Thors: "I sorta glory in the chance to revel in great names." Touching on the names of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and Emerson, he came to Thoreau, calling his autobiographical book, "Walden," one of the "greatest storybooks ever written."

PRaise FOR COURT

Justice Douglas rose from his official bench, a brown wooden one he shared with Mr. Warren, to praise the Thor-minded Massachusetts courts for rulings which helped to clear Walden Pond of beer cans, baby food jars and thumbs of leather gloves.

Touching on the problems of mass invasion of wilderness areas all over the country, Justice Douglas intimated darkly that Thoreau wouldn't have liked a bit the messes that people leave.

Secretary Udall closed the Thorship by suggesting that "Thoreau's reputation has grown more in recent years than that of any other American." He added: "It is the hope of the Wilderness Society that this walk in the woods has relieved some of your quiet desperation."

EXHIBIT 4

COMMEMORATION OF THE HUNDRETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF HENRY DAVID THOREAU, DUMBARTON OAKS, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 11, 1962

PRESENTATION REMARKS INTRODUCING SECRETARY UDALL BY HOWARD ZAHNISER

Dr. ZAHNISER. Honorable Poet, Your Honor Mr. Justice, Mr. President (Lewis Leary) of the Thoreau Society, Mr. Secretary, fellow Thoreauvians of the second century, I am Howard Zahniser, executive secretary of the Wilderness Society, and along with Paul Oehser and Carl Bode, here present, a past president of the Thoreau Society.

A hundred years ago last Sunday Henry David Thoreau died, at 9 o'clock in the morning, at his home in Concord, Mass.

Today is the day after tomorrow of the first century since his burial, in Concord, on May 9, 1862.

Next July 12 we shall observe the anniversary of his birth—only 45 years more than a century ago.

Thoreau's example and his thoughts and writings are in many ways relevant to our generation, and indeed, we surmise, to generation after generation.

Among his perceptions—and expressions—that seem so pertinent to our own conditions are those that emphasize the importance of the quality of wildness in our lives and the importance of our preservation of areas where it can best be experienced.

Thoreau more than a hundred years ago asked for the preservation of wilderness areas for our own true recreation. He also urged a primitive forest for every town—and a committee to see that the beauty of the town received no detriment.

Today we have the great good fortune to have at the high, Cabinet level of our National Government, as the Secretary of the Interior, a Thoreauvian, who knows the values of wildness and the importance of outdoor areas where it can be experienced. It is indeed an opportunity for the Wilderness Society to join with him, here on this greensward in our Nation's Capital, in an observance of the meaning of Thoreau to us today.

It is a very great privilege to introduce, as the leader of our own huckleberry party,

the Executive Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Stewart L. Udall. [Applause.]

REMARKS BY HON. STEWART L. UDALL, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Secretary UDALL. Certainly I know you will all agree we could not have chosen a better place or a better time to have this occasion. The elements have not frowned on us. We are all very happy.

I, of course, was delighted that Justice Warren would be here—and so many of the diplomatic corps. We cannot recognize all of you. There are two people I should like to recognize, though, just for a moment. One is the young poet, Bill Meredith, from Connecticut, who had the idea of this gathering and who is with us here today. Bill, we are all in your debt.

The other is Mrs. Robert Woods Bliss, who, with her late husband, the Ambassador, gave to the public these beautiful grounds and thus made it possible for us to have this occasion here.

I think that nothing is more Thoreausic than this land and what it represents. I think the greatest gift that any man, or any couple, can leave to their fellow man is the gift of a beautiful tract of land. This park here embodies Thoreausic ideals mentioned a while ago, and, therefore, I think it appropriate to thank again the late Ambassador Bliss and Mrs. Bliss for the fact that we can have this occasion here.

I have received several communications. There are two I wanted to read to you.

One is from E. B. White, who said he could not be here, but wrote: "For a dead man, Thoreau manages to keep surprisingly abreast of the news. I find him assaying calm in all weathers and all ideas. I hope he and his friends enjoy a pleasant noon-time."

And Paul Brooks, the Houghton Mifflin editor, who may be here, said: "Someone once said of Henry Thoreau that he could get more in 10 minutes with a woodchuck than most men could get out of a night with Cleopatra."

I am sure this informal gathering would have meant more to Thoreau than all the formal meetings held in his honor.

So I thought we would have a few minutes with two men who, perhaps more than any other in this country, represent the Thoreau spirit and understand it today.

It is my privilege to introduce these two men.

INTRODUCING ROBERT FROST

The first is a man who happens to be exactly twice the age that Thoreau was at the time of his death. Henry Thoreau, when he died 100 years ago, was the age of President John F. Kennedy—44. This, I think, makes us realize how much more he might have contributed had he lived longer.

Robert Frost will be 88 on his next birthday. Robert has the same qualities of mind, the same feeling for this land. He has the same regard for the need of being versed in country things—as he has put it. I think he has the same awareness that Thoreau had of the elusiveness of truth, and most Thoreauvians have as a favorite the story about when he was asked in his last illness whether he had made his peace with God, he replied, "I did not know we had quarreled."

Robert Frost has his own relationship with God, but some have said of him that he is a man who, in his own words, has had a lover's quarrel with the world for 88 years. We are most delighted that, while he is in town, he can be with us to participate on this occasion. [Applause.]

REMARKS BY ROBERT FROST, DISTINGUISHED POET

ROBERT FROST. Well, I sort of glory in a chance to revel in great names—like Emerson and Thoreau. Take them together.

I just noticed a very important thing, to me—speaking of great names—Mrs. Thomas Jefferson Coolidge has sent down to Washington, I believe as a loan, the portraits, the Stuart portraits, of Washington, Jefferson, Adams, Madison, and I think also Monroe. These great names. There is nothing to measure beside those statesmen but the names of Thoreau and Emerson.

The beginning of this—shall I call it something you see but have never thought your way through?—is in what Wordsworth said:

"And I could wish my days to be
Bound each to each by natural piety."

And I bet you have read that as meaning a piety toward God. That was natural—that he meant it entirely in our sense of the word. He meant by piety—call it "nature," right out of Rousseau. It might have been out of Thoreau, if Wordsworth had known Thoreau. We are here in natural piety.

And when they don't know what America is; and it puzzles them as to what America is; and they write abstracts about what it is; I take refuge in certain names: Washington, Jefferson, Adams, Madison—Madison very particularly—and then two great names, Emerson and Thoreau.

And whenever I come under Thoreau's influence—I said the other day, in a collection of Thoreau's manuscripts and other things up in the Morgan Library in New York—they asked me to say something—I said:

"Do you want to know three of the greatest books that were ever written? One of them was 'The Voyage of the Beagle.' Another was the 'Walden' storybook. The three greatest storybooks in history, we say—'The Voyage of the Beagle,' the 'Walden' storybook, and 'Robinson Crusoe.'"

Those are my three great storybooks.

And so I repeat, one of the greatest books we have had in America—and it will always be—is "Walden."

More than anything else Thoreau wrote that wonderful beautiful story book: Character, incident, adventure in thought, adventure in housekeeping, everything.

Whenever I am weary of considerations—there is a line of my poetry somewhere like that—when I am weary of my considerations and I cannot stand it any longer, I always say: "Me for the woods."

Somebody said I talk woods too much. The word "wood" means mad, you know, too. That is it. I want to go wild in the woods.

I have been telling this story a long time. The first poem in my first book is the wish for wilderness where I can get really lost. I never got lost. Daniel Boone said he never was lost, he had been bewildered; but I have not even been bewildered. I want to be where I can be bewildered—lost—not be able to find my way home. That is what the wilderness is. [Applause.]

INTRODUCING WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS

Secretary UDALL. Thoreau called himself inspector of snowstorms. He was that. He had other outside assignments that he took upon himself, too.

I think if Thoreau has any successor as inspector of wilderness, it is William O. Douglas, our next speaker, a man who shares Thoreau's scorn for modern transportation. He is a shank's mare man. He has still today a concern, as lively and as keen as Thoreau's, for the estrangement of man from his natural surroundings.

I think he would share one of the things that Thoreau wrote or said in his last years: "The earth has higher uses than we put her to."

It is a pleasure for all of us to have as our other speaker, to pay homage to Thoreau today, Justice William O. Douglas. [Applause.]

REMARKS BY WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, U.S. SUPREME COURT

Justice DOUGLAS. A recent visitor to Walden Pond, Edwin Way Teale, tells about the

thousands of people who now visit that sanctuary. He wrote in "North With the Spring":

"With Walter Harding, Secretary of the Thoreau Society, and his wife, * * * I made a circuit of Deep Cove, the indentation in the Walden shore line close to the site of Thoreau's cabin. As we walked along, I jotted down all the things we encountered at its edge. * * * The list includes:

"One hundred and sixteen beer cans, 21 milk bottles, 7 Coca-Cola bottles, the remains of 14 campfires, a shoe box, eggshells, soap, half-eaten sandwiches, Dixie cups, cracker boxes, soda straws, cigarette packages, comic books, tabloid newspapers, playing cards, broken glass, paper napkins, mustard bottles, firecrackers, banana peels, orange skins, a baby food jar, a piece of pink ribbon, the thumb of a leather glove, a flashlight battery, and a dollar bill."

This problem of mass invasion of wilderness areas presents serious problems of this character all over the country. We of the Sierra Club arranged for a summer team to collect tin cans and bottles and other debris at four remote lakes in the High Sierra. They packed out three and a half tons of tin cans, etc., which represented only two or three summers of accumulation. On the top of Mt. Whitney another Sierra Club team packed down eight gunnysacks of such debris.

The moral, I think, is plain, and one that Thoreau would be the first to advance were he here: We need more wilderness areas—rather than fewer—and large ones, at that. But the trend is in the opposite direction. Wilderness areas are contracting, though our population is exploding. Even the sanctuaries of Walden are being threatened by man's invasion.

I am reminded of the advertisement: "Come up to unspoiled Vermont," to which Robert Frost replied, with that well-known smile, "And help us despoil it."

Mr. Frost (interrupting). Let me tell you about that. It is on every map in every restaurant, every dining place you know: "Come to Unspoiled Vermont." I always write on it, in my own hand: "And help spoil it."

Justice DOUGLAS (continuing). We are all grateful to the Massachusetts Supreme Court for its 1960 decision in the Nickols case. Plans were made to build concrete ramps for the beaches of Walden Pond, to widen the beach by cutting down the embankment, to cut many trees to provide an access road for fishermen, to put up a 100-foot concrete bathhouse. But for the intervention of the Massachusetts court, Walden Pond would be a highly modernized amusement park.

Thoreau did not know the world. In "Walden" he says that it is not worth while to go around the world to count the cats in Zanzibar. To this comment H. M. Tomlinson once replied that while Thoreau was right about Zanzibar, "we wish he had tried it. He would have counted more than cats. We miss the book he would have made."

Thoreau's curiosity and active mind would indeed have produced an exciting tome on Zanzibar, bringing to light things that its miserable people and the Arab slave traders never knew about the earth and its beauty.

I have traveled with Thoreau everywhere he went in New England. He did not penetrate as far north in the Maine woods as I had imagined. He saw some headwaters of the Allagash, but not the wild river itself—the one which like Walden Pond is now threatened by bulldozers, roads, motels, and civilization. Wherever Thoreau went he was the explorer who was excited, stumped, and baffled by new discoveries. That is a great comfort to all of us amateurs who, no matter how frequent our hiking of old trails, always find something new that sends us to the libraries for research.

Thoreau, for example, never did identify the "night warbler" which I believe was the ovenbird in flight. Once he saw three birds: Were they sandpipers, telltales, or plovers? he asked. "Or they may be the turnstone," he added.

Thoreau's curiosity was about the wonders of creation, including man, but mostly about those wonders which are at our feet and yet which we seldom see. "Is not the midnight like central Africa to most of us?" he asked. The answer as of 1962 is still "Yes." Yet even here along the Potomac great events often transpire at midnight. How many have heard on wild March nights the armada of whistling swans over Georgetown and the pallsades, heading for northern nesting grounds?

We do not have many whippoorwills in this area. Thoreau knew it from the north woods. It ushers in the darkness of night; and before the first grey streaks of dawn are visible, it announces that the time for sleep has almost ended. The haunting song of that wondrous bird had strong appeal to Thoreau, whose wish was that he would hear it in his dreams.

Thoreau—an individualist—would be alarmed at America's present trend to conformity. Thoreau, the individual, did not walk with the crowd, nor think like the crowd, nor bend to society's prejudices. The Bill of Rights was written for his kind, for in a nation of conformists civil rights would be inconsequential.

Emerson said: "Thoreau was in his own person a practical answer, almost a refutation, to the theories of the Socialists. He lived extempore from hour to hour, like the birds and the angels; the only man of leisure in his town; and his independence made all others look like slaves."

Thoreau found his sanctuary, his cathedral, in the woods. The endless wonders of nature were his excitement. A swamp was not a spot to drain, but a place for reflection. The food chains discovered there, the symbiotic relation of plant to plant, of animal to animal, of fungus to tree—these were his excitement.

If we could all say with him "the heavens and the earth are one flower," we would be as anxious to clean up our rivers and to preserve our islands of wilderness as we are to put a man on the moon.

On June 17, 1853, Thoreau noted in his journal: "If a man walks in the woods for love of them for half his days, he is esteemed a loafer; but if he spends his whole day as a speculator, shearing off those woods, he is esteemed industrious and enterprising—making earth bald before its time."

Thoreau lived when men were appraising trees in terms of board feet, not in terms of watershed protection and birds and music. His protests against that narrow outlook were among the first heard on this continent. And they still plague the conscience of the bureaucrats whose voice is the voice of conservation but whose deeds are destructive of wilderness values.

Thoreau lived long before the insecticides and pesticides appeared to upset our ecological balances and to poison the gardens and fields where we grow our food and the waters that carry the poisonous insolubles off our farms into our rivers and lakes.

Thoreau lived when the symbol of destruction of wilderness was the ax and gunpowder. He never knew the bulldozer and the reckless ruinous logging practices in which we now indulge.

Thoreau did, however, know the quiet desperation in which most people lead their lives and man's capacity to destroy the earth and its goodness. His warnings are relevant and timely in the 1960's—more relevant and timely, I think, than when they were uttered. That is the occasion for meeting here today. [Applause.]

CLOSING WORDS BY SECRETARY UDALL

Secretary UDALL. Thank you, Bill.

The verdict of history, I think, as everyone seems to acknowledge in this week of anniversary, is that Thoreau has grown more than any other American, perhaps in the past century, in terms of the growth of the audience that he has gained; his voice is heard in far more places of the world than ever before.

I think that this, of course, is something that all of us glory in.

But here it would simply be our hope—the hope of the wilderness society, those of us who staged this little event here today—that as a result of your walk in the woods, as a result of the remarks here today, as a result of the reading, that you are all going to feel that the quiet desperation of your lives will be somewhat diminished.

Thank you. [Applause.]

THE DEVELOPING DIALOG ON ECONOMIC GROWTH

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an address entitled "The Developing Dialog on Economic Growth," delivered by Dr. Raymond J. Saulnier, professor of economics, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York City, at the commencement exercises of the Babson Institute of Business Administration, Babson Park, Mass., on June 18, 1962.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DEVELOPING DIALOG ON ECONOMIC GROWTH

(An address by Dr. Raymond J. Saulnier, professor of economics, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York City, at the commencement exercises of the Babson Institute of Business Administration, Babson Park, Mass., Monday, June 18, 1962)

I should like to devote my remarks this morning to what we may call, in the current idiom, the dialogue on economic growth.

The question of the adequacy or inadequacy of our rate of economic growth is not a new subject. There was a lively discussion of it in 1959 and 1960, especially in the latter year, but for some months now it has had relatively little public attention. The reason for this is that we have been in a phase of recovery and expansion, and it is only natural that under such conditions interest in the growth question should tend to recede. What is more, business forecasts have been very optimistic, both those emanating from official sources and those put forward by private individuals and groups. One of our leading magazines of business has been talking until very recently—I assume they have stopped now—of a self-winding superboom. It is no wonder that in this atmosphere debate over policies to promote growth has languished.

Suddenly all this has changed. There is now a fairly wide recognition of the fact that the expansion has not been a vigorous one. Not only has it failed by a wide margin to come up to the Federal Government's expectations, but it has been barely up to the standard of the last two recoveries. This was evident as early as last fall and winter but for a variety of reasons the mood of determined optimism persisted. The spell was broken by the stock market. The danger now is that we develop an excessive pessimism and in an effort to stimulate the economy rush into ill-considered measures which in the end may prove to do more harm than good.

In any case, the debate is on, and it promises to be an interesting discourse. Indeed, we are entering into what may well be the most searching reexamination of economic beliefs that our country has ever experienced. We will be talking about some very critical questions of economic policy. Paramount among these is the question of taxes and of fiscal responsibility. Specifically, would it help, in seeking to spruce up the economy, to cut taxes when our balance of international payments is showing a substantial and continuing deficit, when we are losing gold with almost no interruption, and when the Federal budget is already deep in the red? This is, indeed, a very intricate technical question. To draw again on the current idiom, it is a very sophisticated question. But not so sophisticated that it is exempt from commonsense consideration.

And there are other questions that will be dealt with in this dialogue just as important and just as intricate. They are questions that go to the bottom of our understanding of what makes our enterprise economy work. More than that, if we think about them deeply enough, as we must, we shall see that they go to the roots of our economic and political philosophy.

I know I need not tell you that you must interest yourself in this debate. You have completed training for positions of management responsibility in American business. You will, of course, continue to concern yourself primarily with the problems of the business in which you are engaged. But, in our democratic society it is your responsibility as well as your privilege to have a viewpoint on even the broadest problems of public policy. Indeed, if men and women in management positions in American business do not have a reasoned position on these questions, and are not in a position to express that viewpoint cogently and forcefully, then our enterprise system will be in very deep trouble. This will be your dialog as much as the next man's, and I hope you will enter it with a determination to find the truth, wherever the search leads you. You know as well as I do that in the end we have to do business with the truth, even if the truth is so old it looks like a myth.

How can we put the question to which the dialog will be directed? I think we can put it this way: what strategy of public policy will serve us best in achieving a better economic performance within the framework of our preferred and traditional institutions?

When we consider this question we must realize that we do not have an entirely free hand in shaping a strategy for improving our economic performance. No government ever has an entirely free hand in such matters, any more than a business enterprise has a free hand in selecting a strategy for improving its own performance. What we need is a strategy that makes sense for us, here and now, not for somebody else, somewhere else in the world, or even for ourselves at some other time. And the strategy we choose must be consistent with the constraints on policy that inhere in our present posture. Let me briefly describe the major constraints, as I see them.

Chief among them is the limitation that is imposed on us by our international financial position. We must accommodate ourselves to the fact that we have a chronic balance of payments problem. It is not a short-term problem, caused by special, nonrecurring circumstances, nor is it a problem that can be easily or quickly corrected. It is anything but that. The deficit has totaled more than \$14 billion in the last 4 years; efforts to correct it were well under way in 1959 and were intensified in 1960, but it has continued.

It is obvious, I am sure, that we cannot ignore this deficit in shaping a strategy for growth. But we have to go further than

that. We must give top priority to the need for finding a solution to our balance of payments problem.

The first question to ask about any proposal for accelerating growth is what effect it will have on our balance of payments. There are good economic reasons for this, but there are political reasons that are even more important. All the elements of our national strength—financial, economic, military, and moral—together comprise the foundation on which the structure of the free world is built. Our leadership responsibilities in the free world derive from this fact. In the unwelcome but nevertheless continuing struggle with the Communist bloc, which is a struggle for no less than man's freedom, a weakening of our national strength and of our international financial prestige would erode the foundation of our international leadership. I have had occasion recently to see something of the Soviet world and I believe we are winning the struggle against totalitarianism. But if we are to consolidate and extend our successes we must preserve and strengthen our international economic posture. Anything else is unthinkable. It would be the worst kind of folly for us to try to solve our domestic economic problems by means that would weaken our international financial and economic position and prestige.

You will hear some sensible words on this subject, of course; but you will also hear a lot of nonsense, ranging all the way from assertions that there really isn't any balance of payments problem at all, which is totally incorrect, to statements that a given policy will help reduce the deficit when, on examination, it will be seen that the result is just as likely, or even more likely, to be the opposite. You must insist on verifiable facts, whenever these can be had, and keep your logic straight. And whatever else you do, don't make up your mind on the basis of assertions that some things are myths and other things are realities. Let me give you one piece of advice, if I may. You will learn that one man's myth is another man's reality. Take nothing for granted and insist on fact and straight thinking. If this leads you to a truth that is new, don't reject it because it is jarring to your preconceptions. Equally, if it leads you to a truth that is as old as the hills don't dismiss it on the ground that it is old fashioned and, for this reason, is probably a myth.

Let me make one further comment on the deficit in our balance of payments and how its acts as a constraint on economic policy. As long as a deficit persists we shall be hampered in dealing with the problem of economic growth at home. A balance of payments deficit can prevent us from following an aggressive policy of credit ease when such a policy is called for. It is doing that right now, in my judgment. By blocking full use of credit policy, a balance of payments deficit invites a heavier reliance on fiscal policy for countering recessionary tendencies than would otherwise be contemplated. Unfortunately, it also enhances the hazards involved in budgetary deficits. When it comes to the strategy of economic policy, a chronic balance of payments deficit is nothing short of a total nuisance. Top priority in our national economic strategy must be given to its elimination.

The second current constraint on public policy derives from the fact that our Federal Government's budget is even now running a heavy deficit. In the first 10 months of the current fiscal year, that is, in the 10 months through April 1962, there was a deficit of \$9.7 billion in the conventional budget. This compares with a deficit of \$6 billion in the comparable period of the fiscal year 1961. In the first 9 months of fiscal 1962 there was a deficit, seasonally adjusted, of \$6.2 billion in the cash budget. There are, to my knowledge, no published official estimates of Fed-

eral income and product accounts for 1962, but these were running deficits of \$3.1 and \$2.0 billion on a seasonally adjusted annual rate basis in the third and fourth quarters, respectively, of the calendar year 1961.

When we talk about fiscal policy and the benefits that are alleged to accrue from a Federal deficit we must remember that we already have a deficit and that it is a large one. In fact, it is a very large one, and has persisted throughout the current cycle. It is one thing to consider the impact of a deficit that follows a surplus. It is another thing to appraise the economic effects, domestic and international, of piling one deficit on another.

A budget deficit in recession and a surplus in recovery can be called a countercyclical fiscal policy. But a deficit every year, in good times and in bad, is not a policy; it is a failure of policy. It is not a strategy; it is a simple case of fiscal inadequacy and it requires correction.

In addition to these constraints, there are certain standards that must be met by public policy. It is well to remind ourselves of these. It goes without saying that the only acceptable economic policy is one that is good for all Americans. Beyond that, an acceptable policy must be one that makes sense for the long run as well as for the short run. And most important of all, the only acceptable strategy of economic policy is one that will strengthen the free, democratic institutions of our country, including the institution of free private enterprise. There is nothing but misery in store for Americans if we try to solve our economic problems by methods which in the long run will shrink and weaken our enterprise system.

Let me turn now to some of the principal substantive points in the dialog. It would be an imposition on you, and would be impossible, in any case, if I were to try to cover all of them.

First, let us consider the belief that increases in Federal spending and deficits in the Federal budget will promote economic growth. At least we can ask what recent history tells us on this point.

What recent history tells us about the effect of increases in Federal spending is not very favorable to the view that an economy such as ours can spend itself into prosperity via the Federal budget. In the first 10 months of the fiscal year 1962 net budget expenditures were \$6.1 billion higher than in the comparable 10 months of the previous fiscal year. Now this is a very large increase in the spending rate. I think it is fair to say that if questioned on this point in advance of the events most people would have said that the result of such an increase in spending, coming at an early stage in the cycle, would be a recovery far more rapid than would be expected on normal cyclical grounds. But that isn't what happened. Federal spending increased, but it did not stimulate a faster than normal pickup. If it had, we wouldn't be talking this morning about the merits of additional increases in spending or cuts in taxes, and consequent increases in budget deficits, as methods of stimulating an economy that threatens, as the saying goes, "to run out of gas." What this experience tells us is that if the environment is not favorable to an increase in private spending, an increase in Federal spending, even a large increase, is a well-nigh futile exercise. Something must be done to encourage private spending.

Recent experience has also dealt rather harshly with the theory that budgetary deficits will accelerate economic growth. What are the facts in this case? In the first 4 months of this calendar year, the cash budget of the United States ran a deficit of close to \$10 billion, on a seasonally adjusted annual rate basis. In the comparable 4 months of the 1958-59 recovery the Federal

cash budget showed a surplus of \$4.6 billion, on an annual rate basis. Yet the unemployment rate has actually been somewhat higher under the recent deficit than it was under the earlier surplus. There were clouds on the economic horizon in those months of surplus in 1960, but it must be conceded that the economic sky in 1962, under very large deficits, is far from entirely clear.

I have never been very happy with pragmatism as a guide in political philosophy, or in any other branch of philosophy, but I would think that to those pragmatists who regard budgetary deficits as a more or less guaranteed formula for producing a brisk recovery, the present cycle must be a veritable nightmare.

Recent experience certainly provides ground for skepticism as to the restorative and energizing qualities of Federal budgetary deficits, but nowadays there are special reasons for rejecting the deliberate use of them as an instrument for promoting economic growth. These reasons have to do with our balance of international payments. It is one thing to run a budgetary deficit when a recession automatically cuts revenues, or even to create a deficit through emergency tax cuts in order to prevent or reverse a recession. But it is a very different matter deliberately to deepen a deficit by tax reductions when the economy is still in an expansion phase. How could it do anything but undermine confidence here and abroad in the effectiveness of our national economic policies? And if it does this, is there not a chance that it will worsen our balance-of-payments situation? We must make it quite clear to the world that we know how to run our financial affairs. The last thing we want to do is to give the impression that we suffer from a kind of fear of orthodoxy. It must be clear that we both understand the dynamics of our economy and that we are willing to let this understanding guide our policy. If there is a need to cut taxes in the expansion phase of a cycle, when we already have a large deficit, then there is equally a need to consider whether we are now spending too much money on programs that make no contribution whatever to our capacity for growth and to consider whether we are doing other things, entirely outside of the tax field, that are tending to suppress private investment spending. If this is what we are doing, and I think it is, then we cannot retrieve the situation with governmental red ink, and very few really sophisticated people will believe that we can.

So much, for the moment, about Federal spending and budgetary deficits as the keys to prosperity. I think it is safe to say that we will hear a good bit more of both before we hear much less.

Let me turn to a second point. It has not entered the dialog so far, but it is always in the wings, so to speak, and we may hear of it yet. What I have in mind is the theory that economic growth can be accelerated by raising wages. It is the purchasing power theory of prosperity. The theory is that higher wage rates mean higher incomes, that higher incomes mean higher demand, and that higher demand, in turn, means higher production and higher rates of growth.

What does recent experience tell us about this? What it tells us is that since the end of World War II average hourly compensation in private nonagricultural industries, including supplements to wages and salaries, increased, on the average, by 5.1 percent a year. Yet the growth of our economy in this period is regarded by the advocates of still faster wage advances as being inadequate. Furthermore, while wages were rising 5 percent a year, on the average, the purchasing power of the consumer's dollar was reduced by roughly 25 percent.

It is hard to believe that anyone would wish deliberately to experiment further with

this inflationary policy. Whatever other damage such an experiment might do, it would wreck our capacity to compete in world markets, and make well nigh impossible the elimination of our international balance-of-payments deficit. I hope we can say that this bit of mythology is dead, not just for the moment, but for good.

The third and last of the points in the dialog on growth on which I want to comment briefly has to do with business profits.

I am sure you have noted the theory that economic growth is governed largely by the rate of spending on capital goods. It is possible to overdo this theory, as it is possible to overdo any theory, but I think no one would deny that the expansion of our base of physical capital is an essential condition for the achievement of rapid growth. If this is the case, then we must concede that we have done very badly in recent years. In a period in which spending on capital goods in foreign industrial economies, in terms of constant dollars, has been going ahead by leaps and bounds, capital goods spending in our own economy has actually failed to increase at all. In the years 1953-59 the constant dollar amount of capital goods spending rose anywhere from 30 to 80 percent in most Western European countries; in sharp contrast, there was actually a small decline in the United States. Spending on new plant and equipment in the second quarter of 1962 was not as large in dollar amount, at current prices, as it was in 1957, 5 years ago; and if we take account of the fact that the costs of construction of new plants and the prices of industrial equipment have increased significantly in the interim, it must be concluded that we are nowadays installing annually a smaller volume of physical facilities than we were 5 years ago. Obviously, there is no dynamism here. We are not even holding our own. Why is this so? Let me comment on what I think is the most important aspect of this critical question.

It would be a mistake to argue that the volume of capital goods spending depends exclusively on the level of corporate profits. But I think we could agree that profits are a major element, probably the major element, in determining the level of capital goods spending. Is it not important, then, that while wage payments, production, and sales have been rising, corporate profits have remained roughly unchanged? Corporate profits in 1961 were only very little larger, before taxes, than they were in 1955, 6 years earlier, and corporate profits after taxes were actually lower. And this is in current not constant dollars. In these years there was an increase of \$3.2 billion in the dividends paid annually by corporations, but the amount of income retained by corporations fell by \$3 billion or by about 25 percent. This is the point that must not be overlooked in the dialog on growth. We cannot get our economy moving as it should be moving unless we restore some dynamism to business profits.

If this profit deflation, and that is what it is, is to be corrected we must understand its causes. I have no wish to oversimplify this complex question, but if I were to state the cause in one sentence I would say that the squeeze on business profits results from the fact that, whereas price inflation has, for the moment at least, been largely checked, cost inflation continues.

How can we escape from this condition? Surely an escape cannot be found in a resumption of price inflation. Few people would prescribe this. There are some still unreconciled to price stability as an essential condition to the achievement of sustainable economic growth, but inflation is such a thoroughly disreputable idea nowadays that the remaining inflationists are largely silent. They have been silenced, if not entirely persuaded, by the deficit in our balance of payments. Indeed, one of the

great mass conversions of history has taken place on the question of inflation. And the steel industry episode of this spring showed that the executive branch of our Government, from the President on down, is unreservedly committed to a policy of price stability. Circumstances have checked price inflation, but we have not succeeded in stopping cost inflation and therein lies the rub, or the squeeze, or whatever you want to call it.

There are a number of avenues by which we must approach the task of easing this squeeze. As individual businessmen you will find that one way to do it is by practicing complete economy in managing the affairs of your business. We shall also have to do that as a nation. We must remember that the cost of government, Federal, State, and local, is to a very large extent borne by American business as a business cost. And it is a rising cost. I hope that the dialog on growth, in which we have all been invited to participate, will lead to a thorough reexamination of governmental expenditures at the State and local as well as Federal level, the elimination of those expenditures that are not essential, and the passing on of these economies, dollar for dollar, as reductions in business taxes.

There are other avenues to a solution of the problem of cost inflation. One of these is to stabilize, or better still to reduce, unit production costs by achieving a better relationship between advances in wages and improvements in productivity.

The President's Council of Economic Advisers recently advanced a general guideline on this matter in which they stated that wage advances, on the average, should equal productivity improvements, on the average. I think we must conclude that this guideline is inadequate in the present situation. If we agree that there has been a lag in profits, then the guideline should provide for a catchup in profits. Wage increases that will use up labor's full proportionate amount of productivity improvements, which is what the guidelines call for, will leave profits where they are relative to everything else. But we need to improve the relative position of profits. Consequently, what would be best for our economy at this time would be wage advances that are actually less than the improvements in productivity. This would reverse the trend in cost-price relationships that has been suppressing business profits and stifling investment expenditures. It would give profits a chance to catch up. It would also provide opportunities for price reductions which would be enormously helpful in strengthening our international competitive capability, and thus in eliminating our balance of payments deficit. A revision of the guidelines to this end is urgently needed.

In addition to a redefinition of the wage guideline, there are other things that Government can do to help prevent cost inflation. For one thing, the Federal Government is the largest single employer in the United States. Over 2 million persons are employed by the Federal Government in civilian jobs and around 6 million by State and local governments; about 1 out of every 6 persons in the United States is employed in a nonfarm job. You can see from this that there is an enormous influence that could be brought to bear on the cost structure of our economy if Federal, State, and local governments were to adhere to wage and salary policies consistent with a proper guideline principle.

Second, the Federal Government is an enormous indirect user of labor services through the procurement of supplies and in its contracting for construction. It has been alleged time and again that the pace of cost advances in some regions, such as the west coast, where Government procurement is the major element in the economy, is set by the wages paid by Government contractors and

subcontractors. Would it not be possible for the Federal Government, through its procurement agencies, to exercise restraints on cost that are consistent with those it wishes to have exercised by the business community generally? Certainly, it would be a grievous inconsistency if the Federal Government, through its procurement agencies, were to underwrite increases in costs that are inconsistent with its own guidelines.

Third, consideration should be given to the impact on production costs of the determination of prevailing wages under the Davis-Bacon and Walsh-Healey Acts. Under these laws, the Federal Government sets what are in effect minimum wages for labor performed in a great variety of employments. And these minimum wages are well above the level of the minimum wage with which we are most familiar; namely, that which is set under the Fair Labor Standards Act. Certainly the Federal Government should have its own guidelines in mind when it sets minimum wages to be adhered to by its contractors.

You will see that there is a good deal that can be done by Government to achieve the kind of cost-price relationship essential to an improvement in profits, to a revival of plant and equipment spending, and thus to the attainment of a more satisfactory rate of growth.

I have said little or nothing about tax cuts because these other matters are more basic. Let me comment on the current tax discussions very briefly.

We can dispose of the question of the "quickie" tax cut; that is, the temporary cut in individual income taxes very quickly. This is an antirecession measure. But so far as I know, no one is saying that we are in a recession already, and I am not prepared at this time to say that the outlook is so bleak that we need to have recourse to emergency tax cuts. We do need a basic restructuring of our tax system and it would be enormously helpful to reduce the taxload. But that is another matter. We should get started on it as soon as we can but we must do it within the framework of a fiscal policy that will give us a fair chance of balancing the budget over the cycle. Neither our domestic nor our international affairs will permit us to go for very long on a spree of higher spending, lower taxes, and bigger deficits. This would be a totally unworkable economic policy and it wouldn't even be good politics, believe me.

One last word on taxes. Of all the potentially mischievous ideas I have heard re-

cently, none is more discouraging than the notion that tax cuts for business would make it possible to give larger wage increases. But to give wage increases on this basis would totally eliminate the beneficial effects of tax reform. If the dialog does nothing else, I hope it will expose and eliminate that idea before it goes any further.

These are rather serious questions and I am afraid what I have had to say lacks the lightness that is fitting on what is, in every significant sense, a happy occasion. I am reminded of a story I heard only a few days ago. On another commencement occasion, one of our Nation's highest-paid humorists, in counseling the graduating class on the subject of "going out into the world," advised them as follows: "Don't go." This is an intriguing idea but I don't advise it. You enter into careers well trained and you will find them, I am sure, full of excitement and satisfaction. May I say for myself and on behalf of those who have helped you reach this important milestone in your lives, especially for your parents and for the faculty of this institute, that we wish you every happiness and success. You will want to apply yourselves without stint to your individual work. The meaning of my choice of remarks this morning is that I hope you will also make your voice heard in your generation's own distinctive dialog.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AMENDMENT OF THE CAREER COMPENSATION ACT OF 1949, AND MAKE PERMANENT THE DEPENDENTS ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill to amend section 302 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended (37 U.S.C. 252), to increase the basic allowance for quarters of members of the uniformed services and to make permanent the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 as

amended (50 App. U.S.C. 2201 et seq.), and for other purposes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the bill laid before the Senate is H.R. 11221, providing for increases in the basic allowance for quarters for members of the uniformed services.

Mr. President, the military personnel who are eligible for the quarters allowances are those for whom Government-furnished housing is not available. The purpose of the quarters allowance is to offset in part the expenses of military personnel who must occupy civilian housing. Mr. President, the quarters allowances have not been raised since the 14-percent increase granted in 1952.

We may note that there have been increases in the total military compensation for most pay grades as a result of the basic pay increases in 1955 and 1958. If my memory serves me correctly, there have been three increases in the pay of civilian personnel since there have been any increases in housing allowances for members of the Armed Forces.

Mr. President, the concept which was developed as a general guide for this bill is that the quarters allowances for the various military grades should be related to the housing expenses for civilians at income levels comparable to the various military pay grades. The premise is that the housing costs for civilians are closely related to the costs which military personnel are normally required to pay to rent suitable civilian housing. Page 5 of the committee report contains a table setting forth the median housing expenses of civilians with incomes comparable to the military pay grades. The Senate will observe that these costs are closely related to the proposed allowances contained in this bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table which appears on page 5 of the report be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Housing cost analysis

Military grade	Proposed total monthly military compensation ¹	Proposed allowances with dependents	Median civilian housing expense ¹	90-percent rental—15-percent utilities ratio ¹	Military grade	Proposed total monthly military compensation ¹	Proposed allowances with dependents	Median civilian housing expense ¹	90-percent rental—15-percent utilities ratio ¹
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
O-10 general	\$2,125.61	\$201.00	\$175.36	\$181.13					
O-9 lieutenant general	1,783.95	201.00	175.36	181.13					
O-8 major general	1,607.88	201.00	175.36	181.13					
O-7 brigadier general	1,432.88	201.00	175.36	181.13					
O-6 colonel	1,127.98	170.10	167.76	173.88					
O-5 lieutenant colonel	925.38	157.50	157.05	162.50	E-4 corporal (4 years or less service)	\$276.10	\$83.10	\$85.16	\$91.64
O-4 major	802.93	145.05	152.39	157.32	E-3 private, 1st class	240.10	83.10	83.76	90.38
O-3 captain	687.93	130.05	142.23	146.97	E-2 private	201.90	83.10	83.16	89.84
O-2 1st lieutenant	587.88	120.00	125.51	130.41	E-1 recruit	199.30	83.10	83.16	89.84
O-1 2d lieutenant	408.98	110.10	111.07	114.89					
W-4 chief warrant officer	708.93	145.05	145.64	151.11					
W-3 chief warrant officer	618.93	130.05	137.96	142.83					
W-2 chief warrant officer	522.88	120.00	125.51	130.41					
W-1 warrant officer	470.98	110.10	118.33	122.13					
E-9 sergeant major	573.00	120.00	133.27	137.66					
E-8 master sergeant	503.00	120.00	125.51	130.41	E-4 corporal (4 years' or less service)	\$298.00	\$105.00	\$88.16	\$94.34
E-7 sergeant, 1st class	457.90	114.90	118.33	122.13	E-3 private, 1st class	262.00	105.00	84.56	91.10
E-6 staff sergeant	398.10	110.10	110.00	114.00	E-2 private	223.80	105.00	83.16	89.84
E-5 sergeant	348.00	105.00	100.00	105.00	E-1 recruit	221.20	105.00	83.16	89.84
E-4 corporal (more than 4 years' service)	308.10	105.00	93.56	98.70					

¹ The highest income level maintained by the Federal Housing Administration is the single bracket of \$1,200 monthly or more. The civilian figures are the same, therefore, in cols. 3 through 6 as they are set forth opposite the grades O-7 through O-10.

EXTENT OF THE INCREASES

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there are about 2,664,000 military personnel now on active duty. The increases under this bill would be received by approximately 1,267,000, or almost half the total military strength, the remainder being ineligible since they are furnished government quarters.

The remainder, of course, are ineligible, as they are now living in Government quarters.

On a budget average the quarters allowances are increased by 20 percent, representing an additional annual appropriated cost of \$285 million, approximately. The proposed rates for each pay grade are set forth on pages 6 and 7 of the committee report. I ask unanimous consent that the tables be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Proposed new rates for officers and warrant officers

Pay grade	Without dependents				With dependents			
	Present	Proposed	Dollar increase	Percent increase	Present	Proposed	Dollar increase	Percent increase
O-10 general.....	\$136.80	\$160.20	\$23.40	17.1	\$171.00	\$201.00	\$30.00	17.5
O-9 lieutenant general.....	136.80	160.20	23.40	17.1	171.00	201.00	30.00	17.5
O-8 major general.....	136.80	160.20	23.40	17.1	171.00	201.00	30.00	17.5
O-7 brigadier general.....	136.80	160.20	23.40	17.1	171.00	201.00	30.00	17.5
O-6 colonel.....	119.70	140.10	20.40	17.0	136.80	170.10	33.30	24.3
O-5 lieutenant colonel.....	102.60	130.20	27.60	26.9	136.80	157.50	20.70	15.1
O-4 major.....	94.20	120.00	25.80	27.4	119.70	145.05	25.35	21.2
O-3 captain.....	85.50	105.00	19.50	22.8	102.60	130.05	27.45	26.8
O-2 1st lieutenant.....	77.10	95.10	18.00	23.3	94.20	120.00	25.80	27.4
O-1 2d lieutenant.....	68.40	85.20	16.80	24.6	85.50	110.10	24.60	28.8
W-4 chief warrant officer.....	94.20	120.00	25.80	27.4	119.70	145.05	25.35	21.2
W-3 chief warrant officer.....	85.50	105.00	19.50	22.8	102.60	130.45	27.85	26.8
W-2 chief warrant officer.....	77.10	95.10	18.00	23.3	94.20	120.00	25.80	27.4
W-1 warrant officer.....	68.40	85.20	16.80	24.6	85.50	110.10	24.60	28.8

RECOMMENDED INCREASES FOR ENLISTED PAY GRADES E-4 (OVER 4 YEARS) THROUGH E-9

Set forth below are the increased proposed rates recommended for the enlisted pay grades E-4 with over 4 years of service through E-9. It will be noted, as more fully

explained hereafter, that the bill revises the concept of allowances for these enlisted grades by removing them from the Dependents Assistance Act and authorizes the grades a quarters allowance similar to officers.

H.R. 11221—Recommended rates E-4 (over 4 years) through E-9

Pay grade	Without dependents				With dependents			
	Present	Proposed	Dollar increase	Percent increase	Present	Proposed	Dollar increase	Percent increase
E-9 sergeant major.....	\$51.30	\$85.20	\$33.90	66.1	\$77.10	\$120.00	\$42.90	55.6
E-8 master sergeant.....	51.30	85.20	33.90	66.1	96.90	120.00	23.10	23.8
E-7 sergeant, 1st class.....	51.30	75.00	23.70	46.2	77.10	120.00	42.90	55.6
E-6 staff sergeant.....	51.30	70.20	18.90	36.8	96.90	120.00	23.10	23.8
E-5 sergeant.....	51.30	70.20	18.90	36.8	77.10	114.90	37.80	49.0
E-4 corporal with over 4 years' service.....	51.30	70.20	18.90	36.8	96.90	114.90	18.00	18.6
					77.10	110.10	33.00	42.8
					96.90	110.10	13.20	13.6
					77.10	105.00	27.90	36.2
					96.90	105.00	8.10	8.4
					77.10	105.00	27.90	36.2
					96.90	105.00	8.10	8.4

¹ The higher present allowance is authorized for enlisted personnel with 3 or more dependents.

RECOMMENDED ALLOWANCES FOR E-1'S THROUGH E-4'S WITH LESS THAN 4 YEARS OF SERVICE
Summary of increases

The bill recommends an increase of approximately 8 percent for all brackets in the pay grades E-1 through E-4, under 4 years of service.

Rates recommended by bill

Pay grade	Without dependents				With 1 dependent			
	Present	Proposed	Dollar increase	Percent increase	Present	Proposed	Dollar increase	Percent increase
E-4 corporal, under 4 years.....	\$51.30	\$55.20	\$3.90	7.6	\$77.10	\$83.10	\$6.00	7.8
E-3 private, 1st class.....	51.30	55.20	3.90	7.6	51.30	55.20	3.90	7.6
E-2 private.....	51.30	55.20	3.90	7.6	51.30	55.20	3.90	7.6
E-1 recruit.....	51.30	55.20	3.90	7.6	51.30	55.20	3.90	7.6

Pay grade	With 2 dependents				With 3 or more dependents			
	Present	Proposed	Dollar increase	Percent increase	Present	Proposed	Dollar increase	Percent increase
E-4 corporal, under 4 years.....	\$77.10	\$83.10	\$6.00	7.8	\$96.90	\$105.00	\$8.10	8.4
E-3 private, 1st class.....	77.10	83.10	6.00	7.8	96.90	105.00	8.10	8.4
E-2 private.....	77.10	83.10	6.00	7.8	96.90	105.00	8.10	8.4
E-1 recruit.....	77.10	83.10	6.00	7.8	96.90	105.00	8.10	8.4

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it will be noted from these tables that for the officers and warrant officers with dependents, the percentage increases range from 15.1 percent for the lieutenant colonel, to 28.8 percent for the W-1 warrant officer. The monthly dollar increases range from \$20.70 for the lieutenant colonel to \$33.30 for the colonel, representing a 24.3 percent increase. Mr. President, for the officer and warrant grades this bill proposes a range for quarters allowances of \$110.10 a month for the second lieutenant and W-1 officer, up to \$201 for general officers.

The proposed legislation is the result of a long study that was conducted by a committee in the Department of Defense, appointed by Secretary of Defense McNamara. Its membership was composed of civilian personnel. The study grew out of great dissatisfaction which existed—and properly so, I think—on the part of many military personnel that they were not receiving adequate consideration in the matter of housing off-station which it was necessary for them to rent.

CHANGES IN CONCEPT FOR CERTAIN ENLISTED GRADES

There are other changes in the bill.

Mr. President, the bill provides for a change in concept in the quarters allowances for the senior enlisted grades E-4 with over 4 years through E-9. Under the existing provisions of the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 all enlisted grades are subject to what is known as the class Q allotment system. Under the 1950 act each enlisted person must make an allotment from his own pay as a condition for receiving the amounts authorized under the Dependents Assistance Act. This total amount is known as the class Q allotment. The serviceman himself has no right to receive this allotment and it is mailed directly by the military services to the dependent affected. Furthermore, existing law provides for a varying allowance, depending on the number of dependents.

The bill as passed by the other body repeals the class Q allotment, in effect, for the senior enlisted grades E-4 with over 4 years through E-9. These grades are removed from the Dependents Assistance Act and they will be authorized a quarters allowance in the same manner as officers.

With certain misgivings the Senate committee agreed to this provision in the House bill. The change results in their being a single pay rate for those with dependents. This change was made on the theory that the senior enlisted grades are for the most part career personnel and should be sufficiently responsible to their dependents to be paid their own money.

I wish to emphasize, however, that the departments have ample supervisory and command authority to insure that the family responsibilities are met in those few problem cases that are certain to arise where so many people are affected.

It might be observed that the permanent law makes no provision for the class Q allotment system, with the result that

the enlisted man would be authorized to receive the allowance himself.

The bill continues the existing provision authorizing the class Q allotment system for the enlisted grades E-4 with under 4 years through E-1. The Senate committee made 2 changes in the House bill. First, the bill as passed by the House would have made the Dependents Assistance Act permanent law. The Senate committee, after consideration, voted to continue the legislation on a temporary basis. It has been continued every 4 years since 1950 as a part of the extension of the Selective Service laws. The committee was of the view that this measure should be continued on a temporary basis.

Second, the bill as passed by the House would have an effective date of October 1, 1962. The Senate committee amended the bill to provide an effective date of January 1, 1963. Departmental testimony indicated that the January 1 date was needed in order to accomplish the administrative changes necessary in connection with the elimination of the class Q allotment system. It would also result in lessening the cost of the legislation by approximately \$70 million.

We have been very generous with the civil employees of the Government. The military personnel need some increases in their housing allowances. The study of the committee indicates that the rates which are set forth in the pending measure are reasonable. I hope the Senate will approve the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Did I understand the Senator to say that if the bill is enacted it will cost \$70 million annually?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much will it cost?

Mr. RUSSELL. It will cost much more than that.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much?

Mr. RUSSELL. It would cost about \$285 million a year. The \$70 million figure relates to the date that the law takes effect.

Mr. ELLENDER. I did not hear all of the Senator's statement.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Department of Defense requested that the bill become effective on the first day of January next year. The House made it effective the 1st of October of this year. The Senate committee went along with the Department and voted to make the effective date the 1st of January 1963. That is where the \$70 million figure came in.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, the increase in the allowance would go directly to the general or the colonel or the officer who receives it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, indeed; that is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. None of it is to be used in a revolving fund. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. No. We have eliminated the revolving fund in the military construction bill as it was recommended by the Department of Defense. The Department had sent it up in the budget, but it was eliminated. The construction bill did provide for a family

housing account which consists only of funds appropriated for the purpose. The quarters allowance goes directly to the man in the service whether he is a general or a master sergeant who lives off a military base and who cannot find quarters furnished to him by the Government.

Mr. ELLENDER. All of this is strictly to pay for quarters allowances.

Mr. RUSSELL. In lieu of government-furnished housing; yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator believes that the amount of the increase is normal?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is difficult to come to an exact computation, because rental costs in some sections of the country are less than they are in other sections of the country. It is impossible to base allowances on the variation, because there is not the same rate. However, the overall increases are believed to be fair. There have been no increases since 1952, a period of 10 years.

The overall increases compare favorably with the increases in the rent generally throughout the country.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, the Government would pay only the amount that the officer or serviceman must pay, and no more; is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no. That is not the rule at all. Every first lieutenant, for example, will receive the same amount.

Mr. ELLENDER. Whether he pays it in rent or not?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let us suppose that he gets rent for three-quarters of the amount of the allowance. What happens then?

Mr. RUSSELL. He would save about \$25 a month. However, there are many cases where the military personnel are paying a good deal more than the Government is paying them for housing.

In some areas, particularly Alaska, the housing costs are several times over what the man would actually draw if he had to rent his quarters outside.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator have any ruling from the Department of the Army that officers and others who receive allowances should live in quarters in keeping in their rank?

Mr. RUSSELL. No we do not; but the reason why the bill is before the Senate is that the officers are complaining that they cannot provide quarters on their allowances which are comparable with those of persons in civilian life who have comparable incomes. The purpose of the bill is to try to equalize the difference. It will not work out exactly even. There will be some officers who will perhaps have to pay the difference out of their own allowances.

Mr. ELLENDER. Many of them will shop around to get their quarters as cheap as they can and pocket the difference.

Mr. RUSSELL. They will certainly do that; they would not be human if they did not.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I shall support the bill, but I wish to raise a question concern-

ing retired officers on the subject of recomputation.

It was developed before the committee a few weeks ago, and the subject has been before us for some time, beginning in January 1958, when the incentive pay increase bill was passed, that retired personnel got no benefit from the bill at that time. It was felt by many that the situation was inequitable.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator's statement is not exactly correct. The retired personnel received an increase, but they did not get one which was based on what would be paid in the same grade after the enactment of the bill. In the 1958 act all persons retired received a 6 percent increase except for those retired in three and four star-rank who received a 16 percent and 26 percent increase, respectively.

Mr. BUSH. Yes; I thank the Senator for correcting me on that point. However, ever since then there has been the question whether they should not have been treated in a fashion similar to that of those who retired the day after the law went into effect.

Mr. RUSSELL. I will bear emphatic testimony to the correctness of that statement of the Senator from Connecticut, regarding this being a constant question.

Mr. BUSH. Yes. At that time I had contemplated the offering of an amendment to this bill, which would correct that situation. I recall that in a meeting of the Committee on Armed Services a couple of weeks ago the issue was raised, but it was decided then by a majority vote of the committee to postpone action until January 1963. As I recall, this was due to the fact that the Secretary of Defense had appeared before the committee the day before and had stated that he was studying the problem. I believe he said he had a staff of 25 persons—which seems to me to be a large number of people—who were studying the matter. Nevertheless, he said he had the issue under study and would be prepared to make a positive recommendation to the committee in January. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know that the Secretary stated he would make his recommendations in January, but he said he would do so early in the next Congress.

Mr. BUSH. Early in the next Congress.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think the Senator is justified in assuming that the Secretary intended that the recommendation would be made in January. I have the exact language. He said, "It would be presented early in the next session."

The Senator from Connecticut knows this is a highly controversial question, one that has caused no end of trouble in the committee. As chairman of the committee, I can assure him that originally I was inclined to go along with the idea of recomputation, and I had no very strong feeling about it. However, I usually try to support the subcommittees which have heard all the testimony and have done all the work. For that reason, I did not support the first proposal to recompute. I have been con-

vinced since then that recomputation would not be fair to other retired personnel in the low grades. We must have a retired increase method which will be fair to the entire retired list.

Mr. BUSH. I hope that when the Secretary's report is received, it will correct inequities between the groups.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am convinced that it will, because if it does not, Congress will have to do so, since there are a large number of persons in the lower grades who are affected, whereas only some 23,000 would draw substantial benefits from the direct recomputation. Actually, of the 191,000 retired prior to June 1, 1958, there are about 83,000 who would get no increase under recomputation; there are 108,000 who would get some increase, but little for most in the lower grades; then there are the 23,000 in the higher officer ranks who would get annual increases from \$561 to \$4,586.

The Senator is correct in stating that it is time that the Commission studied all phases of the problem of compensation of military personnel. In my judgment, there will have to be some increases in the compensation of military personnel, in view of the very generous increases which Congress has granted the civilian employees. The study will have to include not only the question of allowances, but the question of purchases at commissaries and post exchanges. All of those matters are under review, and a package report should be made early in the next session for Congress to consider. There is no question in my mind that it will be the first legislation the Committee on Armed Services will take up after we have our authorization on the military program. I think it will have to come first.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator for his statement. I sincerely hope that this subject will be considered very early in the next session.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no question that the subject will be threshed out by the Senate early in the next session, if our Government endures, as we all know it will.

Mr. BUSH. I express the hope that the Secretary's report will be favorable to readjustment, so as to overcome the seeming inequity between those who retired the day following the enactment of the 1958 bill and those who retired prior to that date. I think there is a definite need for an equitable settlement on that difference.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know what the group which is studying the question will recommend. There is no question in my mind that it will recommend increases. Just what form the increases will take, I have no way of knowing.

Mr. BUSH. Naturally; I quite understand that. I also hope, as the Senator has suggested, that the report to be submitted by the Secretary will take into account inequities between the grades.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes, indeed.

Mr. BUSH. I think that under the bill before our committee there was definitely unfair treatment to the lower grades.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. BUSH. Some of them received no benefit.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is why the recomputation was not adopted 2 years ago.

Mr. BUSH. Yes. I thank the Senator for his statement. I want to explain why I would not offer an amendment. I have discussed the question with representatives of the Retired Officers' Association as of yesterday and today. As a result of the conversations, I have concluded not to offer a pay adjustment amendment, but to express the hope that the Secretary's report, when it is made, and the action of the committee following that report, will be favorable to the readjustment in a thoroughly equitable way, not only for the officers in the higher grades, but also for the personnel right down the line.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator. I am inclined to think he has made a decision which will be advantageous to all, and that no group can be prejudiced by letting the whole matter be considered in one package early in the next session of Congress.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "6-25-62-B" and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 8, line 12, it is proposed to strike the words "January 1, 1963" and insert in lieu thereof the words "October 1, 1962".

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, the amendment is a simple one. It merely changes the date from "January 1, 1963," to "October 1, 1962."

The Department of Defense has urged the passage of the bill on grounds of desperate need. In my opinion, if the bill is needed now, why wait until 1963 to make it effective? I should like to see the increase in quarters allowance become effective on the day the bill is signed by the President; but I know it will take a little time to put the act into operation. Yet I can see no justification for putting the effective date of the act off until 1963—and no later than October 1, 1962—for surely that will be sufficient time in which to put it into effect.

The Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, has stated that the situation is disgraceful. Therefore, I ask, then why delay until 1963 correcting the situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maine. [Putting the question.]

The "ayes" have it, and the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on this amendment, I request a division; and I desire to address myself briefly to the amendment.

I have no very strong feelings about the amendment; and knowing the tendency of the Senate, I assume that the amendment would have very strong support, because it involves the expenditure of \$70 million more than the Department has requested—and also \$70 million above the budget, I may state.

When the Secretary of Defense was before the committee, he was asked about this matter. He testified that it would

require that several hundred thousand personnel be offered an opportunity to change their allotments; and he said that to the extent that they did change them, the allotments would have to be processed. He said a huge task is therefore involved, both with the basic rate changes and with the form in which the payments are to be authorized; and he said that in order to achieve an orderly transition from the current structure to the new structure, they believe more time than would be available between the date of the passage of the bill and October 1 should be allowed, and that, therefore, they continue to recommend that the date be January 1.

Mr. President, out of deference to the Secretary—although, as I have said, I have no strong personal feelings about the matter—I feel that this amendment should at least be made subject to a division vote.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine will state it.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I make the point of order that the decision of the Senate on the question of agreeing to the amendment was announced before a division was requested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's point of order is well taken. However, the Chair should have given the Senator from Georgia, who was on his feet, an opportunity to request a division, and should have announced, "The 'ayes' appear to have it." But the Chair is informed by the Parliamentarian that the Chair actually announced "The 'ayes' have it."

So the Senator from Georgia will have to request reconsideration.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I shall be willing to do so, although it has been the rule here for so long that the memory of man runneth not to the contrary that a Senator who is on his feet may request a division. However, I do ask that the vote on the amendment be reconsidered, and I so move.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maine. [Putting the question.]

The "noes" appear to have it; and the "noes" have it, and the amendment is rejected.

The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 11221) was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An Act to amend section 302 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended (37 U.S.C. 252), to increase the basic allowance for quarters of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

DEFENSE EXPENDITURES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in last night's Washington Star the Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Zuckert, was quoted as having defended the \$51.6 billion Kennedy administration budget against charges by former President Eisenhower that it reflects "unjustified fears" and "outmoded concepts."

In the course of his statement, Mr. Zuckert, the Secretary of the Air Force, stated:

I have never seen a military budget which has received the intensive scrutiny this one has.

If there was such scrutiny it certainly was not on the floor of the Senate, where debate of this huge appropriation was perfunctory.

Also, Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished former Secretary of the Air Force, the present senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], called on former President Eisenhower to specify exactly where he favored reductions in the budget.

Mr. President, I am one of the few Senators who have supported former President Eisenhower in his statement that he believes the defense budget should be reduced; but at the time I did so, I also called on former President Eisenhower to indicate where he favored making cuts in the defense budget. So I warmly support the request made by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON].

Former President Eisenhower commands the respect, the admiration, and the affection of the American people, and I believe there is no field in which he is more expert or more competent than the defense field. So if he will speak up and will indicate where he believes the budget should be cut or reduced, that will give tremendous assistance to those of us who have been working hard in the Congress to discuss the defense budget on its merits and to try to reduce unnecessary spending. In the course of doing so, we hope to have, of course, a stronger defense, not a weaker one; and we hope to do so on the basis of eliminating the wasteful diversion of men and material as well as money into outmoded weapons; and instead obtaining the strongest defense we possibly can obtain.

In the course of his statement, former President Eisenhower said:

Accordingly, I personally believe—with, I am sure, very little company in either party—that the defense budget should be substantially reduced.

Mr. President, the trouble is that former President Eisenhower is likely to

have very little support in that connection unless he specifies where he thinks the cuts should be made.

It happens that I favored reducing the appropriation for an additional aircraft carrier. The position taken by former President Eisenhower could add great and even decisive strength to that position; and I believe that in the future, when these appropriations come up again, we can make solid progress in terms of reducing unnecessary expenditures, if the former President will support us.

Once again I assert that I shall never vote to make any reduction in our defense expenditures which in my judgment would in any significant way weaken our national security. But I do favor making reductions in the defense budget, because, as former President Eisenhower has stated, I believe we are wedded to outmoded concepts; and I believe that we have a weaker, not a stronger, defense when we wastefully spend money on the Defense Establishment.

COUNTRY NO LONGER FACES POSSIBILITY OF SERIOUS ECONOMIC DEPRESSION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the President of the United States has called for a debate on economic policy. As I said yesterday, I think that request by the President is a very wise one, and certainly we need such a debate.

As has recently been indicated, the meeting of the Economic Policy Committee of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development in Europe indicated that today even the leading economic experts in Europe are very much undecided about the economic dilemma which faces the leading country in the free world, the United States of America. So this is an ideal time for a debate among Senators and Members of the House of Representatives in regard to the economic policies which should be adopted.

Leading spokesmen for the administration have suggested the possibility of a tax cut, and the President has indicated that he believes that he should have greater authority to increase spending. So we have some definite policy proposals to consider.

In an article published this morning, Walter Lippmann takes the position that he believes the administration has not done enough in provoking an economic debate, because it has not requested a tax cut this year, and has been a little vague about the kind of tax cut it wants made next year.

Mr. President, I respectfully disagree with Mr. Lippmann. I believe we do have the basic question before us; and I believe that those of us who are interested in economic policy now have a golden opportunity, and should either come forward with our own alternatives to the administration's proposals, or else we should support the administration's proposals.

This afternoon, I should like to stress the importance of having all Americans, particularly those in high policymaking

positions in either business or the government, recognize that it is no longer likely that we shall face a serious depression. The former Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Humphrey, stated, for example, that if we continue with the kind of extravagant spending that has been urged, we might have "a depression that will curl your hair."

I think he was a very distinguished man and a very successful businessman, but I think if we adopt the notion that we must act suddenly one way or another to prevent a depression, we are likely to take panic action or precipitous action that would be unwise and unnecessary.

At the same time, others have said that unless we have a tax cut, unless we have increased spending immediately, unless the Government takes decisive action either now or beginning early next year, we are likely to have a depression. I think this is wrong. I think we must recognize the great difference in the economy we are now enjoying as compared with the economy that existed not 30 years ago, but only 10 years ago.

I have in my hand the economic indicators for June 1962, the most recently available economic indicators. They show that the element of personal income, which has risen most rapidly, is transfer payments. These are social security payments, unemployment compensation payments, and payments of that kind, these have been rising rapidly, and will continue to rise rapidly. They now constitute a perfectly immense source of income that is stable and increasing, and in a recession or depression would not decline, but would increase.

How great these payments are as compared with 1953 is indicated by the fact that in 1953 the transfer payments constituted \$14.3 billion. Today, less than 10 years later, they are \$33 billion—2½ times as large.

We now have a situation in which transfer payments—social security and unemployment compensation payments primarily—are more than twice as high as all the dividends paid in this country. Shortly they will be higher than all business and professional income received in this country. They are three times as high as all the farm income received in this country. As a matter of fact, within 3 or 4 years they are going to be the greatest source of income other than salaries and wages. In depression this income which was nonexistent 30 years ago and relatively small 10 years ago will increase, not decrease.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I commend the Senator for calling on the former Commander in Chief as well as the Chief of Staff of the Army who criticized the defense budget we recently passed as being too high. It is easy whenever a bill gets as large as \$42 billion, to say it is too high, but the essential thing is to point out what items should be cut. In the testimony before us, from all the experts there, they were asking

for a budget 25 percent more than they got. They were the experts. The House cut their requests down about \$500 million. Most of our restoration was for the B-70.

I think they ought to make up their minds whether they want the B-70 or not, and not piddle around, as I told the Secretary of the Air Force. I said, "you may recall the quotation, 'If you are going to cross the Rubicon, cross it—don't stand in the middle and reach for both sides.' Either we want it or we do not want it." As the distinguished Senator said, the B-70 is the only recognized superiority we have over Russia; they cannot touch it.

Now coming to the economic problem, I agree that we have built-in safeguards that we did not have in the great depression of the 1930's, but I want to call attention to the fact that in the thirties banks made loans on real estate on an estimated 50 percent of their value and went broke. Now banks are making loans on real estate on 90 percent or more of their value. Does not the Senator think that if we have a real depression, real estate values will go down more than 10 percent? If they do, we have billions of dollars tied up in FHA loans by banks and insurance companies. Whether that will "curl your hair or not," it will be very bad. I agree with the Senator that we should not engage in reckless spending.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I join the Senator from Virginia in his opposition to reckless spending. We have Government insurance on mortgages that we did not have in the deep depression of the 1930's.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is true, to the extent of \$38 billion, but how much money do we have behind that? Very little.

Mr. PROXMIRE. We also have Government insurance on bank deposits, which, if it has not made banks completely runproof or ruinproof, has come very close to it. It has been many years since there has been any bank failure. I feel this is another great source of strength.

What I am pleading for is recognition on the part of business and Government leaders that we do not have to be afraid of a serious depression simply because the stock market is dropping sharply, and that we should have solid confidence in the overall economic system we have.

I had called attention to transfer payments and the fact that these payments have become a stabilizing influence on income.

I now point to another firm basis of even graver importance. A recent analysis by U.S. News & World Report shows that three-quarters of total spending—three-quarters of the gross national product—represents spending of the type that tends to stay up regardless of business conditions and actions in downturns. Spending on food, clothing, and other soft goods represents \$160 billion. Spending for rent, transportation, and so forth represents spending of \$147 billion. Government spending—which we recognize is unlikely to decrease in a recession, but perhaps increase—represents another \$110 billion. These ex-

penditures alone represent three-quarters of our gross national product. In a recession period they will not drop significantly. They are stable.

ECONOMIC OUTLOOK GOOD

The most interesting aspect of this analysis is one that is not stressed as much as I think it should be. In the quarter of the economy where spending does tend to fluctuate, there is no present basis for fearing recession. On the contrary, there is substantial expectation of expansion and improvement. Fortune magazine today has come out with the prediction that the next 2 years are going to be prosperous and expansive.

When we recognize fully the main ingredients of this segment where the economy has fluctuated, we see five types of spending. One is on automobiles, in which spending has been about \$45 billion. I think anyone who thinks about the automobile industry must recognize that this industry has done well this year, better than it has done since 1955, and gives every promise of continuing to be good in coming years. We have more highways than ever, and more people who will be driving. We have a substantially sustained income from the source. We have every hope and indication that automobiles will continue to be in demand, especially because of the increasing competitive situation in the automobile industry, and because prices and costs have stabilized.

HOMEBUILDING EXPECTED TO IMPROVE

The second type of spending has suffered a long cyclical downturn. It should begin to turn up; That is, home construction with \$43 billions involved. And in fact, housing starts have improved. Home improvements have increased substantially. But they are still below what they were in 1950. With more people, more income and greater likelihood of more family formations, there is every expectation that homebuilding will be increased. The construction cycle suggests such an improvement is due.

Also, this area is in control of the Government to a considerable extent because of Government determination of interest rates, which have such an enormously important bearing on homebuilding.

In the period 1955-57, when the Federal Reserve began a policy of hard money and increased interest rates, although income, wages, and population were increasing, homebuilding dropped sharply. I submit the drop was directly attributable to high and rising interest rates. Interest is such a big and decisive cost in homebuilding. A 1-percent difference in interest rates on a \$20,000 home paid for over 30 years could make a \$3,000 difference in the cost of the home.

So here is an area where, if the policymakers on the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury Department can decide to give the economy a stimulus. They can reduce interest rates and increase homebuilding. There is a great, pent-up demand in this field. I think we can expect, on any basis, to have this area of the economy improve steadily.

The next item is investment in machinery and equipment, where \$28 billion of spending is expected.

Of course, the stimulation for this portion of the economy is a part of the President's tax bill, in which he proposed the investment credit. I happen to oppose that proposal. I do not think it is sound. However, if the administration proposal would have any effect at all it should have some stimulating, not discouraging effect, if it should pass.

At the same time, the administration is engaged in a revision of the depreciation schedules. Many people think this is a wise and necessary policy, and would stimulate investment in new machinery and equipment. It certainly should.

At any rate, the automation which the economic experts say is the wave of the future in our economy is likely to assist in stimulating the new machinery and equipment area substantially. So here is a third area in which we can expect an expansive not a contracting effect on the economy.

The next area of fluctuation in our economy which might fluctuate up or down is additions to inventories of business. This is another area in which we can expect in the future a stimulating effect in the economy, because inventories have not increased lately as sales have increased. In fact, there has been a reduction in inventories. But now that inventories are low relative to sales we can expect not only a stabilizing influence in the economy but also an expansionary effect in this regard.

EXPORTS MAY BE A FACTOR

The only other area remaining is a relatively small item, the net exports to other countries of about \$3 billion. We all expect that if no other major bill of this administration should pass this session, the President's trade bill is very likely to pass. The whole purpose of the President's trade bill is to increase exports to other countries. That is the main purpose of the bill. While the trade bill is controversial and will affect some industries in our Nation in an unfavorable manner, we all agree it is likely to have an overall effect of stimulating exports.

So, Mr. President, on every one of these items—the automobile industry, the homebuilding industry, new machinery and equipment, additions to inventories, and net exports to other countries—we can expect the economy to move ahead, to expand, and to improve.

So far as the remainder of the economy is concerned, as the U.S. News & World Report in its very careful analysis shows, these are areas in which we are very unlikely to observe a cutback in spending. We have not had that in the past. There is every reason to believe that the necessities which are bought by American families will continue to be bought.

Under these circumstances, it seems to me it makes sense for the policymakers, whether they be in business or in Government, to realize that we have a stable economy, an economy which is likely to move ahead, an economy which can be stimulated further by dropping

the present very rigorous tight-money policy which has resulted in the tightest ratio between the money supply and the gross national product that has been experienced in 30 years. Under these circumstances, it seems, a sharp tax cut or an increase in Government spending is not warranted.

Mr. President, there is one other point I wish to make in connection with economic policy at this time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, before he embarks upon a new subject?

Mr. PROXMIER. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not an economist, but it has seemed strange to me that so much fear could be expressed with business generally moving as well as it is. Employment is high. The freight car loadings, retail sales, and standards of that kind are favorable.

One of the things which has always disturbed me about the base of our whole economy and business life has been the great reduction in our gold supply. It may not mean anything. Some people say it does not. As a practical matter, though, the United States does not have enough gold on hand to meet the outstanding notes against it. In other words, there is not enough gold in the bank at Fort Knox to meet the obligations set out by way of law. There is a 25 percent requirement, I believe, for backing of the currency. There are foreign holdings of dollar credits which must be paid in gold, much greater in amount than previously.

I think that if we get into any serious trouble, it will be partly psychological.

Does the Senator think there is any danger whatever that there may be a run on the gold of America from abroad, due to fears generated by the debacle in the stock market?

Mr. PROXMIER. I agree with the Senator from Georgia that this is a very serious matter which we should consider carefully.

There is no question in my mind in regard to the fact that the unfavorable balance of payments which exists, which will continue to deplete and to limit the gold supply, is a problem we have not solved or even begun to solve. The stock market effect is bound to be adverse in this situation.

As the Senator has indicated, the foreign claims on our gold have increased to such an extent that they exceed our gold supply. If as is very unlikely the foreign claims should be called, then our gold supply could possibly be completely exhausted. This conceivably could be true even if we gave up the present legally mandatory 25 percent gold backing for currency.

I think there are a number of things which we can do. One of them is to try to have a balanced budget. We can try to have a situation which will inspire confidence on the part of people abroad. I think this also would help to contribute toward a solving of the specific balance-of-payments problem.

The difficulty is that although the United States has a very favorable bal-

ance of trade, it has an unfavorable balance of payments because of our foreign aid program, because of the fact that our troops are stationed abroad, and also because of some exodus of American capital abroad. I think all these things are subject to the control of our Government.

There will be a very serious problem if we do get into the position of depleting our gold, and it might become so serious that we might have to interrupt our foreign aid program. Some people feel that might not be a bad idea.

What would be even more dangerous is that we might have to interrupt the stationing of American troops abroad. We might have to call back some of those troops.

To some extent, this problem has already been demonstrated by the action taken under President Eisenhower, when he ordered the elimination of support for the families of servicemen stationed abroad. It was a great sacrifice for those who served abroad. It had an adverse effect on morale. I am sure that former President Eisenhower gave that order with great reluctance.

Of course, a more definitive action would be to bring the troops home. Therefore, I say this may have a serious effect on the defense of the free world, and it concerns us very much.

There are a number of things which we can do, but I think the basic action we can take is to make sure there is a stable, respected, and effective fiscal policy in this country which will result in balancing the budget, certainly in times of prosperity.

Mr. RUSSELL. One of the things which has prompted me consistently to vote for reductions in the foreign aid program has been the fear that we might put into the hands of others—even though of friends—the power to demoralize our economy, at least temporarily. That would be an almost certain result if there were to be a run on our gold holdings. I do not refer to a slight run, for we have been experiencing that for a couple of years. There has been a gradual depletion of our gold stocks. However, all the creditors have not come in to stand at the door at one time, as we have seen on the closing of a bank when a president absconded with the money of the depositors. The depositors lined up at the doors.

If all of the holders of dollar credits were to line up at one time, I think it might demoralize our economy a great deal, and to a certain extent offset the fine safeguards to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. PROXMIER. I thank the Senator from Georgia. The feeling on the part of European economists and bankers seems to be mixed. A majority of them, according to the President of the United States, feel that we should try to get our economy moving by a tax reduction, by increasing our spending, and by having high interest rates. I take the exactly opposite position.

It is interesting to note that recent reports suggest a number of European economists disagree with the majority opinion and feel that the United States

can follow a successful policy of fiscal restraint and of monetary ease. Along that line, I wish to say that the argument always made against those of us who favor some credit ease is that this will aggravate the balance of payments situation because if U.S. interest rates are lower than the interest rates abroad there will be a tendency for people who invest in this country's obligations to sell those obligations and to buy bonds abroad, particularly the short-term obligations. I might say almost exclusively the short-term obligations, since those involve virtually no risk.

There are two answers to this contention. One answer is that the Federal Reserve Board can follow a policy of keeping interest rates on short-term obligations high—a policy which has not been followed but which could be followed—and keeping interest rates on long-term obligations low. If the Board did that we would not lose our capital. There would be a stimulation of home building and a stimulation of other industries which depend upon low interest rates.

The other proposal, which I do not support but which has a great deal of support in the Senate, I know, for I have talked to a number of Senators who feel this way, as well as support among some economists in this country, relates to the fact that the United States is virtually the only country in the free world which has not had controls on the movements of capital. While this is a recourse we reluctantly would take, there is no reason why the Government could not say to investors, to those who would take advantage of higher interest rates abroad by moving their capital, the taking of capital from the United States could endanger the position of our gold and the position of our defense establishment throughout the world. You are therefore not permitted to invest American capital in foreign bonds.

So I think there are answers. We can stimulate our economy, in my judgment, and stimulate it substantially without running a bigger deficit, without increasing spending sharply, and without sharp reduction in taxes at a time when we are enjoying prosperous periods, at a time when we are enjoying a peaceful period. Now, if ever, we should have a surplus, or at least a balance in our budget, we ought to have it now.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Why There Will Be No Big Setback in Business" published in the U.S. News & World Report, issue of July 2, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY THERE WILL BE NO BIG SETBACK IN BUSINESS

Once more talk of recession is heard in Washington. This time it is related to the upset in the stock market. Late 1962 or early 1963 is referred to most often as the probable starting point for a decline in business.

The possibility of a recession in 1963 was mentioned publicly on June 19 by Ewan Clague, U.S. Commissioner of Labor Statistics. Speaking in Atlantic City, Mr. Clague

pointed out there has been a business decline every 2 or 3 years since World War II. He added that it was too early to tell whether the stockmarket sag would hasten a recession.

If the stock market does turn out to be signaling another recession, the Government's planners are confident that it will be moderate. They point out that in past recessions, industrial output has dipped from 5 to 14 percent; personal income very little, and gross national product scarcely at all.

NO BUBBLES TO BURST?

Other reasons are given for confidence. For one thing, the Government's appraisers of the business outlook see no speculative bubbles that are likely to burst, now that the stock market has gone through a severe shakeout.

Effect of the stock market upset on business confidence and individual spending plans is described as uncertain.

At bottom, however, the confidence of Government planners in the underlying strength of business rests upon grounds other than business sentiment. These planners see a number of cushions in the American economy that tend to soften any downward trend in business activity.

An important point is made of the fact that more than \$3 out of every \$4 in the Nation's total spending now is subject to very little fluctuation. That provides a substantial underpinning for general business activity.

THE BIG SPENDERS

More than 20 percent of total dollars spent are government dollars—payments made by Federal, State, and local governments for goods and services. Government spending now is on the rise. Demand coming from government for goods and services will increase in the period ahead.

Another cushion is the flow of dollars that individuals and families spend for necessities—food, clothing, gasoline and other types of soft goods. This amounts to more than 29 percent of the country's total spending. The outlay for necessities seldom decreases much when business activity slackens.

A third cushion is provided by spending for services—rent, transportation, home repairs, medical care. This accounts for nearly 27 percent of total spending, and people have been increasing their outlay for services for many years, during periods of good business and bad.

That leaves less than \$1 in \$4 that is subject to sharp fluctuations as business goes up and down.

At the present time, Government planners fail to detect any pronounced weakness in this less stable area of spending. Spending for autos, furniture, appliances has held high. Business investment in new equipment, though less than the planners had expected, also is going on at a relatively high level.

Building activity seems to be headed for another record year. Residential building, lagging early in the year, recently has turned up sharply—largely in apartments.

OUTLOOK IN INVENTORIES

It is pointed out that shifts in inventories of business often are a cause of trouble. The signs are, however, that inventory accumulation has not been excessive. Steel inventories, in fact, are getting down to the point where increased buying is expected to be forced by September. The ratio of inventories to sales is shown by Government reports to be much lower than a year ago. So the planners believe that in the period immediately ahead inventory policies will not be a drag on activity.

In the judgment of officials who advise on Government policy, more than three-fourths of present total spending is of the type that

will be maintained or will rise through this year and in 1963. And they do not expect a collapse in the purchase of cars, homes, and household goods, even though demand for these items may shrink a bit.

Another source of strength for business is seen by Government analysts in stable personal income. When business turns down and workers lose jobs, unemployment benefits and old-age pensions turn up. Government payrolls also usually expand. Together, these payments make up around 20 percent of total personal income and act to offset shifts in other types of income.

In the 1957-58 recession, income of wage and salary workers, business proprietors and farmers, payments on dividends, rents and interest dropped by \$5.7 billion a year. But benefit payments and Government payrolls went up by \$3.2 billion, holding the decline to \$2.5 billion. That performance was repeated in 1960-61, when a decline of \$2.8 billion in other personal income was offset by a rise of \$2.1 billion in Government wages and salaries and in benefits. That held the overall dip to a modest \$700 million.

These cushions in personal income tend to keep individual purchasing power on an even keel and thus bolster total consumer spending.

Planners cite additional protections against serious business setbacks.

Farm incomes, for example, are protected by Government price supports and other aids. Bank deposits and shares in savings and loan associations are insured by the Government, thus protecting people's savings and insuring against financial panics. Mortgages now can be paid off over a long period of years, and many are insured by the Government. That prevents a wave of foreclosures.

IF RECESSION COMES

In the years since the deep 1929 depression, Government has installed a whole series of safeguards to prevent a repetition of that crash. Observers cite the mild recessions of 1948-49, 1953-54, 1957-58, and 1960-61 as evidence that these safeguards are reliable. They see no reason to believe that safeguards will not operate effectively again if a recession occurs late this year or early in 1963.

Finally, there is the power of the Government itself to stem a downturn in business. Government can and probably will increase its own spending to offset a drop in private business. A tax cut to add to people's purchasing power and to corporate profits already has been promised for next year.

Actually, as the Government planners view the problem, the issue is not how to prevent a recession from leading to a severe setback, but how to increase total business activity. The way to solve that problem has not yet been found by the President and his advisers, but they are considering a number of approaches. Among them are more liberal depreciation allowances for business, in the hope that they will stimulate investment, promote growth, and provide jobs.

At the moment, however, the planners are scanning the economic skies for signs of recession.

MANN CREEK FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECT, IDAHO

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1580, Senate bill 405.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 405) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Mann Creek Federal reclama-

tion project, Idaho, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 2, line 10, after the word "block", to strike out:

Costs allocated to irrigation in excess of the amount determined by the Secretary to be within the ability of the irrigators to repay within said fifty-year period shall be returned to the reclamation fund from such net revenues derived by the Secretary from the disposition of power marketed through the Bonneville Power Administration as are over and above those required to meet any other present capital costs assigned for repayment from such revenues.

And insert:

Costs allocated to irrigation in excess of the amount determined by the Secretary to be within the ability of the irrigators to repay within the repayment period or periods herein specified, shall be returned to the reclamation fund within such period or periods from revenues derived by the Secretary of the Interior from the disposition of power marketed through the Federal power system in southern Idaho.

And after line 24, to strike out:

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in connection with the Mann Creek project, to construct basic public recreation facilities but such facilities (other than those necessary to protect the project works and the visiting public) shall not be constructed until an agreement has been executed by the State of Idaho, an agency or political subdivision thereof, or an appropriate local agency or organization to assume the management and operation of the facilities. The cost of constructing such facilities shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable under the reclamation laws.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in connection with the Mann Creek project, to construct minimum basic public recreation facilities, and to acquire such lands as may be necessary for that purpose, substantially in accordance with the plan in the report of the Secretary of the Interior, but such facilities (other than those necessary to protect the project works and the visiting public) shall not be constructed until an agreement has been executed by the State of Idaho, an agency or political subdivision thereof, or an appropriate local agency or organization to assume the management and operation of the facilities. The cost of constructing such facilities shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable under the reclamation laws.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of providing irrigation water for approximately five thousand and one hundred acres, conserving and developing fish and wildlife, and providing recreational benefits, the Secretary of the Interior, acting pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto), is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the facilities of the Mann Creek Federal reclamation project, Idaho. The principal works of the project shall consist of a dam and reservoir, diversion facilities from the reservoir, and drainage facilities.

SEC. 2. The base period provided in subsection (d), section 9, of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, as amended, for repayment of the construction cost properly chargeable to any block of lands and assigned to be repaid by irrigators may be extended to fifty years, exclusive of any development period, from the time water is first delivered to that block. Costs allocated to irrigation in excess of the amount determined by the Secretary to be within the ability of the irrigators to repay within the repayment period or periods herein specified, shall be returned to the reclamation fund within such period or periods from revenues derived by the Secretary of the Interior from the disposition of power marketed through the Federal power system in southern Idaho.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in connection with the Mann Creek project, to construct minimum basic public recreation facilities, and to acquire such lands as may be necessary for that purpose, substantially in accordance with the plan in the report of the Secretary of the Interior, but such facilities (other than those necessary to protect the project works and the visiting public) shall not be constructed until an agreement has been executed by the State of Idaho, an agency or political subdivision thereof, or an appropriate local agency or organization to assume the management and operation of the facilities. The cost of constructing such facilities shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable under the reclamation laws.

(b) The Secretary may make such reasonable provision in the works authorized by this Act as he finds to be required for the conservation and development of fish and wildlife in accordance with the provisions of the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act (48 Stat. 401, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 661 and the following), and the portion of the construction costs allocated to these purposes, together with an appropriate share of the operation, maintenance and replacement costs thereof, shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable. Before the works are transferred to an irrigation water users' organization for care, operation, and maintenance, the organization shall have agreed to operate them in such fashion, satisfactory to the Secretary, as to achieve the benefits to fish and wildlife on which the allocation of costs therefor is predicated, and to return the works to the United States for care, operation, and maintenance in the event of failure to comply with his requirements to achieve such benefits.

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated such sums as will be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendments are agreed to en bloc.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1620), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEED FOR THE PROJECT

In normal years the 5,060 acres comprising the project received no more than a 60-percent supply of irrigation water although total runoff is adequate for the needs of the area. Most of the runoff occurs in the spring before it can be put to use, frequently causing floods and considerable loss and damage to property. Under present conditions farmers have no choice of cropping but continue with a hay and grain operation whether it is desirable or not. There is no opportunity, because of lack of late water, to set up a suitable crop rotation program. The area has an ideal climate for growing seeds, fruits, berries, tomatoes, melons, and other similar type crops for which there is a ready market. With a timely and adequate water supply the grain crops that are in surplus would largely disappear to be replaced by those types that are always in demand.

DESCRIPTION OF PLAN

The project would provide supplemental irrigation water for 4,465 acres and a full supply for 595 acres of land on Mann and Monroe Creeks near the town of Weiser in western Idaho.

The principal works are the Spangler Dam and Reservoir on Mann Creek, diversion facilities from the reservoir to the existing Joslin Ditch, and drainage facilities for the Mann Creek area of the project. The drainage facilities would be constructed by the irrigators after the project is placed in operation and the need for them became evident. Existing distribution systems would be used and any additions or extensions would be made by the farmer. The dam would be a rolled earthfill structure creating a reservoir of 13,000 acre-feet capacity of which 11,000 would be for irrigation.

The reservoir would enhance the resident game fish population as a result of an anticipated reservoir fishery. Further, the facility would serve as a small waterfowl resting area. The recreational benefits of this water storage include boating, fishing, camping, and possibly swimming. This aspect, although somewhat incidental, has a particular appeal to the residents of the surrounding townships, because of the lack of any large water impoundments in the area.

Cost and repayment

Cost:	
Reimbursable, irrigation-----	\$3,390,000
Nonreimbursable, fish and wildlife and recreation-----	100,000
Total-----	3,490,000
Repayment of irrigation costs:	
Irrigators, 50 years-----	1,014,000
Southern Idaho Federal power revenues-----	2,376,000
Total-----	3,490,000
Benefit-cost ratio, 100 years-----	1.52-1

The contract between the Department of the Interior and the Mann Creek Irrigation District would require that the district operate and maintain the facilities during the repayment period in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior.

WAURIKA RECLAMATION PROJECT, OKLAHOMA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1581, Senate bill 114.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 114) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Waurika reclamation project, Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 4, line 23, after the word "purposes", to insert "so long as the space designated for those purposes may be physically available, taking into account such equitable reallocation of reservoir storage capacities among the purposes served by the project as may be necessary due to sedimentation"; on page 5, line 3, after the word "to", to strike out "the project water users the care, operation, and maintenance of" and insert "a water users' organization the care, operation, and maintenance of"; and on page 6, line 16, after the word "game", to insert a comma and "and the protection of the public health, safety, and welfare"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the Waurika reclamation project, Oklahoma, in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto), except so far as those laws are inconsistent with this Act, for the principal purpose of storing, regulating, and furnishing water for municipal, domestic, and industrial use, for irrigation, for controlling floods, and for the conservation and development of fish and wildlife and the enhancement of recreational opportunities. The Waurika project shall consist of the following principal works: the Waurika Dam and Reservoir, an aqueduct system, pumps, canals, laterals, drains, and other irrigation works.

SEC. 2. In constructing, operating, and maintaining the Waurika project, the Secretary shall allocate the costs thereof among different functions resulting from multiple-purpose development under the following conditions:

(a) Allocations to flood control, recreation, and the conservation and development of fish and wildlife shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable under the reclamation laws.

(b) Allocations to municipal water supplies, including domestic, manufacturing, and industrial uses shall be repayable through contracts with municipal corporations, or other organizations as defined by section 2, Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187), under the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws, and, to the extent appropriate, under the provisions of the Water Supply Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 319). Such contracts shall precede the commencement of construction of any project unit affecting the individual municipality or industrial users, and shall provide for all repayment of construction costs allocated to municipal water supplies in not to exceed fifty years from the date water is first delivered for that purpose, and notwithstanding the provisions of the Water Supply Act of 1958, supra, relating to the rate of interest. Payment of said construction cost shall include interest on the unamortized balance of that allocation at a rate equal to the average rate (which rate shall be certified by the Secre-

tary of the Treasury) paid by the United States on its marketable long-term securities outstanding on the date of this Act and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum: *Provided*, That such contracts shall provide that annual municipal and industrial payments shall be continued, after the municipal and industrial water supply obligation has been fully repaid with interest as provided above, at such annual rate and for such period of time as may be determined by the Secretary as is necessary to fully repay costs allocated to irrigation which will not be repaid by the irrigators as provided in section 2(c) of this Act.

(c) Any contract entered into under section 9, subsection (d), of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 for payment of those portions of the cost of constructing, operating, and maintaining the Waurika project, which are properly allocable to irrigation, and which are assigned to be paid by the contracting organization, shall provide for the repayment of the portion of the construction cost of the project assigned to any contract unit or, if the contract unit be divided into two or more blocks, to any such block, over a period not to exceed fifty years, exclusive of any permissible development period, provided that appropriate adjustment shall be made in the amount that irrigation water users shall repay due to payments made by municipal and industrial water users on cost allocated to irrigation as provided in section 2(b) of this Act and provided further that such contracts may be entered into without regard to the last sentence of section 9, subsection (c), of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939.

(d) The water users' organization shall be responsible for disposal of all water surplus to its requirements, and the revenues therefrom shall be used by the organization for the retirement of project debt payment, payment of interest, and payment of operation and maintenance cost of the project: *Provided*, That nothing in this section is intended to preclude the temporary furnishing of irrigation water under contracts appropriate for that purpose, from Waurika Reservoir with or without the construction of specific irrigation works.

(e) Upon the completion of the payment of the water users' construction cost obligation, together with the interest thereon, the water users shall have a permanent right to the use of that portion of the project allocable to municipal, industrial, and irrigation water supply purposes so long as the space designated for those purposes may be physically available, taking into account such equitable reallocation of reservoir storage capacities among the purposes served by the project as may be necessary due to sedimentation.

Sec. 3. The Secretary is authorized to transfer to a water users' organization the care, operation, and maintenance of the works herein authorized, and if such transfer is made, to deduct from the costs allocated to municipal water use the reasonable capitalized equivalent of that portion of the estimated operation and maintenance cost of the undertaking which, if the United States continued to operate the project, would be allocated to flood control and fish and wildlife purposes, and to deduct from the costs allocated to irrigation the reasonable capitalized equivalent of the total additional cost during the irrigation repayment period of operating the screens for protection of fish at the irrigation intake. Prior to the taking over of the care, operation, and maintenance of said works, the water users' organization shall obligate itself to operate them in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army with respect to flood control and the Secretary of the Interior with respect to fish and wildlife.

Sec. 4. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in connection with the works authorized by this Act, to construct minimum basis recreational facilities and to arrange for the operation and maintenance of the same by an appropriate State or local agency or organization. The cost of constructing such facilities shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable under the Federal reclamation laws.

(b) The Secretary may, upon conclusion of a suitable agreement with any qualified agency of the State of Oklahoma or a political subdivision thereof for assumption of the administration, operation, and maintenance thereof at the earliest practicable date, construct or permit the construction of public park and recreational facilities on lands owned by the United States adjacent to the Waurika Reservoir when such use is determined by the Secretary not to be contrary to the public interest, all under such rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe. No recreational use of any area to which this section applies shall be permitted which is inconsistent with the laws of the State of Oklahoma for the protection of fish and game, and the protection of the public health, safety and welfare. The cost of constructing, operating, and maintaining the facilities authorized by this subsection shall not be charged to or become a part of the costs of the Waurika project.

Sec. 5. Expenditures for Waurika Reservoir, and the water supply aqueduct system, may be made without regard to the soil survey and land classification requirements of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1954 (43 U.S.C. 390a).

Sec. 6. The construction, operation, and maintenance of the Waurika reclamation project shall be subject to and in accordance with the provisions of the Act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564).

Sec. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of the works authorized to be constructed by section 1 of this Act the sum of \$25,019,500, plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be required by reason of changes in the cost of construction of the types involved in the Waurika project as shown by engineering indices. There are also authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be required for the operation and maintenance of said works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendments are agreed to en bloc.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 114) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1621), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

S. 114, introduced by Senators KERR and MONRONEY authorizes construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the multipurpose Waurika project in Oklahoma.

This project is located in southwestern Oklahoma in Jefferson, Stephen, Cotton, and

Comanche Counties. Waurika damsite is in Jefferson County about 6 miles northwest of Waurika on Beaver Creek, a tributary of Red River. The urban areas which would be furnished water supplies from Waurika Reservoir surround the Beaver Creek Basin. The lands to be irrigated from the reservoir are located along the north bank of the Red River near Ryan, Okla., near the confluence of Beaver Creek, about 20 miles downstream from Waurika damsite.

The Waurika project would provide for maximum practicable regulation of Beaver Creek flows at the damsite for the dominant purpose of municipal and industrial water supply for six municipalities and an oil refinery and a vital national defense installation. It would provide for construction of the Waurika Dam and Reservoir; an aqueduct system to deliver Beaver Creek flows from the reservoir to the cities of Lawton (including Fort Sill), Duncan, Waurika, Comanche, Temple, Walters, and the DX-Sunray refinery; a pumping plant and distribution system at a point 20 miles below the damsite to deliver reservoir releases to lands in the vicinity of Ryan, Okla., for the irrigation of about 2,000 acres; and recreation and fish and wildlife facilities. The project would provide essentially full control of floods on Beaver Creek at the Waurika damsite and desirable flood control benefits along the Red River.

Need for flood control was emphasized at the hearings on the measure. Testimony indicated that in year after year the city of Waurika has been inundated by the waters of Beaver Creek. As recently as June 11, 1962, the committee received a communication from Senator MONRONEY advising that a new flood, similar to those previously reported had occurred. The Red Cross had set up shelters for 150 persons as 80 blocks flooded and 100 families had from 6 to 18 inches of water in their houses. From 200 to 250 people had to be evacuated. The Department report indicated that the flood control storage space in the reservoir would prevent floods along Beaver Creek from the damsite to its confluence with Cow Creek and substantially reduce flood hazards below that point. The operation would be in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army.

Project studies indicate that the Waurika Reservoir will yield about 44,000 acre-feet of water annually. The predicted year 2015 demand is 39,000 acre-feet per year for municipal and industrial purposes. Until that year, there is ample surplus water available for irrigation of some 2,000 acres of land downstream from the reservoir. By the end of the initial 50-year municipal repayment period, needs for additional municipal water will then begin to encroach upon the supply available for irrigation.

Land classification studies established that ample high quality lands are available for irrigation development. The project studies also established that inclusion of irrigation as a project purpose, using water that is surplus to municipal and industrial needs, would be economically justified. The increased crop returns which would result to the farmers and the increased income which would accrue to business interests in the surrounding areas supported this conclusion. They also established that the increased crop returns which would result from irrigation would permit the irrigators to pay all irrigation operation, maintenance, and replacement costs and repay all construction costs of the pumping plant and distribution system, as well as a portion of the joint reservoir costs allocated to irrigation. On the basis, utilization of the surplus water for irrigation of 2,000 acres was deemed merited and included in the project plan. It provides for full utilization of valuable land and water resources.

The project plan contemplates that operation of the reservoir would recognize the primary demand for satisfying municipal and industrial water requirements. On this basis, the first 115,000 acre-feet of the 155,000 acre-feet of conservation storage capacity would be jointly used for municipal and industrial water supply and irrigation purposes and the last 40,000 acre-feet would be reserved at all times for municipal and industrial use.

The National Park Service has concluded that the Waurika project could provide reservoir recreation opportunities of substantial value to the population of the general area. The plan provides for recreation facilities at and near the reservoir, as recommended by the National Park Service. Project funds would provide for land acquisition and construction of minimum basic facilities required for the protection and accommodation of the visiting public. These would include access roads, parking areas, water supply and sanitation, picnic areas, overlook developments, boat-launching ramps, beach developments, protective fencing, tree planting, and grass seeding. If found to be in the best interests of the Federal Government, funds would be transferred under appropriate agreement to the Division of Recreation and State Parks of the State of Oklahoma Planning and Resources Board for construction of these basic facilities. Additional recreation facilities not appropriate for Federal construction would be provided by local interests. After authorization, a more detailed recreation plan would be developed by cooperative efforts of Federal and State agencies and the water users' organization. Thus, full consideration would be given to recreation needs, to safeguarding of the public health, and to problems of administering and supervising both the recreation and water supply functions of the reservoir.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS TO THE COLORADO RIVER COMMISSION OF NEVADA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1582, Senate bill 3089.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3089) to amend the act directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada in order to extend for 5 years the time for selecting such lands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1622), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF MEASURE

S. 3089 would extend to March 6, 1968, the time within which the State of Nevada, acting through its Colorado River Commission could select certain areas of Federal lands for purchase and development by the State. Specifically, the bill would amend Public Law 85-339 (72 Stat. 31) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to segregate for a period of 10 years, instead of the present 5

years, an area of Federal land in southern Nevada. It also extends the time for the State to exercise its option of selection and purchase for the 10-year period. Both S. 3089 and the law it amends were sponsored by the senior Senator from Nevada, Senator BIBLE.

Some 60 million acres of land in Nevada, or 87.5 percent of the total area of the State, now are owned by the Federal Government. In 1957, the 85th Congress authorized the State to purchase an area comprising approximately 126,775 acres in Eldorado Valley, about 25 miles southeast of Las Vegas. The exterior boundaries of the lands from which the State could make specific selections, in tracts of not less than 10,000 acres, were set forth in the act, and the Secretary of the Interior was directed to segregate the entire area from all forms of entry under the public land laws for 5 years from enactment. During this time, the Secretary was to have had appraisal made of the fair market value of the lands in the entire transfer area. The State would then make its selections, and submit a plan for their development.

Four years now have passed, and the appraisals were completed only recently. The State is not satisfied with the prices set by the Interior Department, and negotiations now are underway for revision. Unless the extension proposed by S. 3089 is granted, the time limitation set by the 1957 law will expire and the State will be forced to accept the Department's prices or forfeit its rights and hopes for development under the bill.

The committee finds that equity and sound public policy call for approval by Congress of the proposed extension.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada acting for the State of Nevada", approved March 6, 1958 (72 Stat. 31), is amended as follows:

- (1) in section 2, strike out "five years" and insert in lieu thereof "ten years"; and
- (2) in section 3, strike out "five-year" and insert in lieu thereof "ten-year".

DIVISION OF TRIBAL ASSETS OF THE PONCA TRIBE OF NATIVE AMERICANS OF NEBRASKA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1583, Senate bill 3174.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3174) to provide for the division of the tribal assets of the Ponca Tribe of Native Americans of Nebraska among the members of the tribe, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, on page 3, line 13,

after the word "select", to strike out "from" and insert "for"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the membership roll of the Ponca Tribe of Native Americans of Nebraska shall be closed at midnight of the date of enactment of this Act, and no child born thereafter shall be eligible for enrollment. The Secretary of the Interior with advice and assistance of the tribe is authorized and directed, pursuant to such regulations as may be issued by him, to prepare a final roll for the purposes of this Act of the members of the tribe consisting of the persons whose names appear on the census roll of April 1, 1934, with the supplement thereto of January 1, 1935, and their descendants of not less than one-fourth degree Indian blood of the Ponca Tribe of Native Americans of Nebraska, regardless of place of residence, who are living at the time the roll is closed, and in so doing shall provide a reasonable opportunity for any person to protest against the inclusion or omission of any name on or from the roll. The Secretary's decision on all protests shall be final and conclusive. After all protests are disposed of, the final roll shall be published in the Federal Register. Upon publication of the roll in the Federal Register, the Secretary shall give the adult members an opportunity to indicate their agreement to the division of tribal assets in accordance with the provisions of this Act and when a majority of the adult members have indicated their agreement, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register a notice of that fact.

SEC. 2. Each member whose name appears on the final roll of the tribe as published in the Federal Register shall be entitled to receive in accordance with the provisions of this Act an equal share of the tribe's assets that are held in trust by the United States. This right shall constitute personal property which may be inherited or bequeathed, but it shall not otherwise be subject to alienation or encumbrance.

SEC. 3. (a) All property of the United States used for the benefit of the Ponca Tribe of Native Americans of Nebraska is hereby declared to be a part of the assets of the tribe, and all of the tribe's assets shall be distributed in accordance with the provisions of this section. The distribution shall be completed within three years from the date of this Act, or as soon thereafter as practicable.

(b) The tribe shall designate any part of the tribe's property that is to be set aside for church, park, playground, or cemetery purposes, and the Secretary is authorized to convey such property to trustees or agencies designated by the tribe for that purpose and approved by the Secretary.

(c) Each member may select for homestead purposes and receive title to not to exceed five acres of tribal land that is being used for homestead purposes by such member, or that is not used and selected by some other member. The member shall pay the current market value of the homestead selection excluding any improvements or repairs constructed by such member, his wife, children, or ancestor, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior.

(d) All assets of the tribe that are not selected and conveyed to members shall be sold by competitive bid at not less than the current market value, and any member shall have the right to purchase property offered for sale for a price not less than the highest acceptable bid therefor. If more than one member exercises such right, the property shall be sold to the member exercising the right who offers the highest price.

(e) The net proceeds of all sales of tribal property, and all other tribal funds, shall be used to pay, as authorized by the Secretary,

any debts of the tribe. The remainder of such proceeds and funds shall be divided equally among the members whose names are on the final roll, or their heirs or legatees. Any debt owed by a member, heir, or legatee to the tribe or to the United States may be set off as authorized by the Secretary against the distributive share of such person. Any member of the tribe who purchases tribal property in accordance with this section may apply on the purchase price his share of the proceeds of all sales of tribal property, and the Secretary of the Interior shall adopt sales procedures that permit such action.

Sec. 4. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to partition or to sell the complete interest (including any unrestricted interest) in any land in which an undivided interest is owned by a member of the Ponca Tribe of Native Americans of Nebraska in a trust or restricted status, provided the partition or sale is requested by the owners of a 25 per centum interest in the land, and the partition or sale is made within three years from the date of this Act. Any such sale shall be by competitive bid, except that with the concurrence of the owners of a 25 per centum interest in the land any owner of an interest in the land shall have the right to purchase the land within a reasonable time fixed by the Secretary of the Interior prior to a competitive sale at not less than its current market value. If more than one preference right is exercised, the sale shall be by competitive bid limited to the persons entitled to a preference. If the owners of a 25 per centum interest in the land so request, mineral rights may be reserved to the owners in an unrestricted status. The Secretary of the Interior may represent for the purposes of this section any Indian owner who is a minor, or who is non compos mentis, and, after giving reasonable notice of the proposed partition or sale by publication, he may represent an Indian owner who cannot be located.

(b) All restrictions on the alienation or taxation of interests in land that are owned by members of the Ponca Tribe of Native Americans of Nebraska three years after the date of this Act shall be deemed removed by operation of law, and an unrestricted title shall be vested in each such member.

Sec. 5. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make such land surveys and to execute such conveyancing instruments as he deems necessary to convey marketable and recordable title to the individual and tribal assets disposed of pursuant to this Act. Each grantee shall receive an unrestricted title to the property conveyed.

Sec. 6. Nothing in this Act shall affect any claims heretofore filed against the United States by the Ponca Tribe of Native Americans of Nebraska.

Sec. 7. Nothing in this Act shall affect the rights, privileges, or obligations of the tribe and its members under the laws of Nebraska.

Sec. 8. No property distributed under the provisions of this Act shall at the time of distribution be subject to any Federal or State income tax. Following any distribution of property made under the provisions of this Act, such property and income derived therefrom by the distributee shall be subject to the same taxes, State and Federal as in the case of non-Indians: *Provided*, That for the purpose of capital gains or losses the base value of the property shall be the value of the property when distributed to the grantee.

Sec. 9. Such amounts of tribal fund as may be needed to meet the expenses of the tribe under this Act, as approved by the Secretary of the Interior, shall be available for expenditure. There is authorized to be appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated such sums as may be necessary to reimburse the tribe for such expenditures, and carry out the respon-

sibilities of the Secretary under the provisions of this Act.

Sec. 10. When the distribution of tribal assets in accordance with the provisions of this Act has been completed, the Secretary of the Interior shall publish in the Federal Register a proclamation declaring that the Federal trust relationship to such tribe and its members has terminated. Thereafter, the tribe and its members shall not be entitled to any of the special services performed by the United States for Indians or Indian tribes because of their Indian status, all statutes of the United States that affect Indians or Indian tribes because of their Indian status shall be inapplicable to them, and the laws of the several States shall apply to them in the same manner they apply to other persons or citizens within their jurisdiction. Nothing in this Act, however, shall affect the status of any Indian as a citizen of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1623), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of S. 3174, introduced by Senator CHURCH, of Idaho, at the request of the Department of the Interior as a result of an executive communication dated April 6, 1962, is to provide for the division of the tribal assets of the Ponca Tribe of Native Americans of Nebraska among the members and to terminate Federal supervision and control over the tribe.

CANCELLATION OF IRRIGATION CHARGES AGAINST NON-INDIAN-OWNED LANDS, OREGON

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1584, Senate bill 3342.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3342) to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior canceling irrigation charges against non-Indian-owned lands under the Klamath Indian irrigation project, Oregon, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1624) explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The purpose of S. 3342, introduced by Senator CHURCH, of Idaho, at the request of the

Department of the Interior, is to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior canceling irrigation charges against non-Indian-owned lands under the Klamath Indian irrigation project, Oregon.

The act of August 13, 1954 (68 Stat. 719), terminating Federal supervision over the Klamath Indian Tribe authorized the adjustment or cancellation of reimbursable construction, operation, and maintenance charges against the Indian land on the Klamath irrigation project. The Secretary of the Interior, by an order on April 10, 1961, canceled a total of \$266,619.64 of construction and operation and maintenance costs on Indian land. A construction charge of \$50 per acre on Indian-owned land remains on one of the three units in the project. This represents the maximum amount (\$70,619) the land is capable of paying, according to the Indian Bureau's economic analysis.

S. 3342 would adjust or cancel reimbursable charges against non-Indian lands within the Klamath project in accordance with the act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1803), which requires congressional approval before it is effective. The Secretarial order approved by this legislation cancels a total of \$329,301.86 in construction costs and \$72,138.69 in operation and maintenance costs on the non-Indian land. The cancellation of construction costs and operation and maintenance costs are conditioned upon the execution of contracts by the landowners for the repayment of such charges to the extent of \$68,615.70.

The reasons for the cancellations are that most of the costs were incurred prior to 1928, the date of the Federal Lien Act, and those costs are not a lien against the land. Also some of the costs are chargeable against lands that were removed from the project in 1939. The effect of the bill is to place the non-Indian landowners on this project in the same position as the Indian owners.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in accordance with the Act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1803; 25 U.S.C. 389), the order of the Secretary of the Interior canceling \$401,440.55 of reimbursable irrigation costs chargeable to lands in the Klamath Indian irrigation project is approved.

REVISION OF BOUNDARIES OF CAPULIN MOUNTAIN NATIONAL MONUMENT, N. MEX.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1585, Senate bill 2973.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2973) to revise the boundaries of Capulin Mountain National Monument, N. Mex., to authorize acquisition of lands therein, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,

with an amendment on page 2, after line 16, to strike out:

SEC. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 3. There are authorized and appropriated such sums as necessary to carry out the acquisition of this land, provided that the cost of the acquisition of private land shall not exceed \$2,500.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to preserve the scenic and scientific integrity of the Capulin Mountain National Monument in the State of New Mexico, and to provide for the enjoyment thereof by the public, the boundaries of the monument are hereby revised to include the following additional lands:

NEW MEXICO PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN

Township 29 north, range 28 east: section 5, north half northwest quarter southeast quarter, northeast quarter northeast quarter southwest quarter, southeast quarter northwest quarter, northeast quarter southwest quarter northwest quarter, south half southeast quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter, south half south half northeast quarter northwest quarter, containing approximately 95 acres.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior, in furtherance of the purposes of this Act, may acquire, in such manner and subject to such terms and conditions as he may deem to be in the public interest, lands and interests in lands within the area described in section 1 of this Act. When acquired, such lands and interests in land shall be administered as a part of the Capulin Mountain National Monument in accordance with the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes," approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.).

SEC. 3. There are authorized and appropriated such sums as necessary to carry out the acquisition of this land, provided that the cost of the acquisition of private land shall not exceed \$2,500.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1625) explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

This bill would revise the boundary of Capulin Mountain National Monument to include an additional 95 acres.

NEED

The area recommended for acquisition includes lands south and west of the proposed headquarters area, and lands adjacent to the site where the monument access road intersects New Mexico State Route 325. These lands are needed for the location of a

park sewerage system, needed for visitor and employee facilities. Due to the topography, this facility could be best located on the lands proposed to be acquired.

ADDITION OF CERTAIN LANDS TO NATIONAL FORESTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1586, Senate bill 3112.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3112) to add certain lands to the Pike National Forest in Colorado and the Carson National Forest and the Santa Fe National Forest in New Mexico, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, on page 2, line 15, after the word "north", to strike out "half," and insert "half" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the exterior boundaries of the Pike National Forest in Colorado are hereby extended to include the following described lands:

SIXTH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN

Township 11 south, range 69 west

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive;
Sections 9 to 16, inclusive;
Sections 21 to 27, inclusive;
Sections 34 to 36, inclusive.

Township 12 south, range 69 west

Section 2, west half west half;
Section 3, east half;
Section 10, northeast quarter;
Section 11, west half northwest quarter;
Section 12, south half northwest quarter, west half southwest quarter;
Section 13, west half northwest quarter, northwest quarter southwest quarter;
Section 14, south half northeast quarter, southeast quarter northwest quarter, northeast quarter southwest quarter, northwest quarter southeast quarter;
Section 21, north half, southeast quarter;
Section 22, north half, north half southwest quarter, southeast quarter;
Section 23, southwest quarter southwest quarter;
Section 26, northwest quarter northwest quarter;
Section 27, west half southwest quarter;
Section 28, north half, southeast quarter.

Township 12 south, range 70 west

Section 23, southeast quarter;
Section 24, southwest quarter, northwest quarter southeast quarter, south half southeast quarter;
Section 25, northeast quarter northeast quarter, west half northeast quarter, west half;
Section 26, northeast quarter, north half southeast quarter.

SEC. 2. The exterior boundaries of the Carson National Forest in New Mexico are hereby extended to include the following described lands:

NEW MEXICO PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN

Township 23 north, range 9 east

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive;
Sections 9 to 12, inclusive.

Township 24 north, range 9 east

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive;
Sections 9 to 16, inclusive;
Section 20, east half;
Sections 21 to 29, inclusive;
Sections 32 to 36, inclusive.

Township 25 north, range 9 east

Section 1;
Sections 33 to 36, inclusive.

Township 26 north, range 9 east

Sections 25 and 36.

Township 23 north, range 10 east

Section 3;
Section 4, north half, northwest quarter southwest quarter, east half southeast quarter;

Section 5, northeast quarter, northwest quarter southeast quarter;

Section 6, north half, north half southwest quarter.

Townships 24 and 25 north, range 10 east
All.

Township 26 north, range 10 east

All, except east half of sections 13 and 24.

Township 27 north, range 10 east

Sections 31 to 36, inclusive.

Township 24 north, range 11 east

Section 5, southwest quarter, south half northwest quarter, southwest quarter northeast quarter;

Sections 6 to 8, inclusive;

Sections 16 to 19, inclusive;

Section 20, north half, southwest quarter, west half southeast quarter;

Section 29, west half northwest quarter;

Section 30;

Section 31, north half.

Township 25 north, range 11 east

Sections 5 to 9, inclusive;

Section 16, north half, southwest quarter;

Sections 17 to 19, inclusive;

Section 20, north half, southwest quarter;

Section 31, west half.

Township 26 north, range 11 east

Section 6.

Also, that part of the Sebastian Martin grant, as described on survey plat approved December 17, 1892, and filed in volume 4, page 22, New Mexico land claim plat records of the Bureau of Land Management, lying east of the projection northward of the line between lot 4 of section 33 and lot 1 of section 34, fractional township 22 north, range 10 east, New Mexico principal meridian, as shown on public land survey plat of August 8, 1924.

SEC. 3. The exterior boundaries of the Santa Fe National Forest in New Mexico are hereby extended to include the following described lands:

(1) The Polvadera grants as described on plat of survey approved December 18, 1899; and that part of the Juan Jose Lobato grant, as described on plat of survey approved October 19, 1895, lying southerly of the Rio Chama River; excepting from the above areas the town of Abiquiu grant as described on plat of survey approved November 16, 1896, and also as shown on public land survey plat approved July 3, 1940; said grant plats being filed in volume 5, page 31, volume 4, page 12, and volume 8, page 6, respectively, of New Mexico private land claim plat records of the Bureau of Land Management.

(2) The Ojo de San Jose grant as described on plat of survey approved August 21, 1902, and filed in volume 5, page 14, New Mexico private land claim plat records of the Bureau of Land Management, excepting that triangular-shaped part in the northwest corner of said grant which overlaps the east boundary of the Canon de San Diego grant as shown on said plat of August 21, 1902.

(3) The Juan de Gabaldon grant, as described on plat of survey approved July 27, 1896, and filed in volume 2, page 10, New Mexico private land claim plat records of the Bureau of Land Management.

Sec. 4. Subject to any valid existing rights, all lands of the United States in areas described in sections 1, 2, and 3 hereof, administered by the Secretary of Agriculture under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act of July 22, 1937, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1010-1012), or used by the Secretary of Agriculture for research purposes, are hereby added to and made parts of the respective national forests.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1626) explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The purpose of the bill is to encompass within the exterior boundaries of the Pike National Forest in Colorado about 18,100 acres and within the Carson and Santa Fe National Forests in New Mexico about 249,700 acres. These areas are now within land-utilization projects which for many years have been administered by this Department for land conservation and land utilization pursuant to title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act of July 22, 1937, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1010-1012), and in part for forest and range research purposes.

The recommended bill would give national-forest status to about 223,000 acres of Federal lands within the described areas. These Federal lands adjoin or are adjacent to the national forests to which they would be added and now are protected and managed in conjunction with them. A portion of the land in Colorado additionally constitutes a part of the Manitou Experimental Forest, a Forest Service research area which also includes nearby Pike National Forest lands.

The bill would add to the Pike National Forest parts of the Fountain Creek land-utilization project and two small parcels aggregating about 84 acres presently used for forest and range research. It would add to the Carson National Forest the Taos land-utilization project and the easterly portion of the Sebastian Martin grant which is a part of the northern New Mexico grantland land-utilization project. Areas to be added to the Santa Fe National Forest are the Ojo de San Jose grant land-utilization project, the Juan de Gabaldon grant land-utilization project, the Polvadera grant, and the part of the Juan Jose Lobato grant which lies south of the Rio Chama River. The two areas last noted are parts of the northern New Mexico grantland land-utilization project.

The lands to be added to the Pike National Forest are similar in their resources to lands already in the forest, and are in the headwaters of the South Platte River. They are well suited to multiple-use management for watershed, timber, forage, and wildlife purposes, and some of them have material values for public recreation. Some cur-

rently form a part of the Manitou Experimental Forest.

The lands to be added to the Carson and Santa Fe National Forests lie in the upper Rio Grande watershed. Careful protection and management to restore and maintain adequate vegetative cover is essential to reduce soil erosion and enhance watershed capacity. They present the same multiple-use management problems and opportunities as do the nearby national forests and currently are managed in conjunction therewith.

All of the lands with which the draft bill deals have been administered by the Forest Service since about 1938, except those in the northern New Mexico grant-land project which were assigned to it for management in 1954.

HOMESTEAD ENTRY OF LEWIS S. CASS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1587, Senate bill 2530.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2530) regarding a homestead entry of Lewis S. Cass.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior shall reinstate the homestead entry of Lewis S. Cass (Anchorage Numbered 031055) that was canceled because at the time the entry was made the land was in a withdrawn status, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to process the entry in accordance with the applicable provisions of law, subject to such modification of time requirements as he deems equitable in view of the prior cancellation of the entry.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1627) explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The records of the Bureau of Land Management show that Mr. Cass' entry was allowed by the acting manager of the Anchorage land office on September 20, 1955. The lands embraced within the entry consisted of 57.07 acres, described as lots 3 and 4, section 23, township 1 south, range 14 west, Seward meridian, Alaska. Approximately 18 months after the entry was allowed, it came to the attention of land office personnel that the land entered by Mr. Cass was not subject to homestead entry. In 1949 the land had been withdrawn by public land order 585 (14 F.R. 1895) "from settlement, location, sale, and entry under the public land laws except the applicable coal or other mineral leasing laws, for classification and examination, and in aid of proposed legislation."

On August 26, 1953, public land order 585 was modified by public land order 913 (18 F.R. 5294) and the land was declared not subject to the initiation of any rights or to any disposition under the public land laws until so provided by an order of classification to be issued by an authorized officer opening the lands to application under the Small Tract Act of June 1, 1938, 43 U.S.C. 682a, et seq.

On March 27, 1957, a letter was sent to Mr. Cass, informing him that his entry, apparently having been erroneously allowed on withdrawn lands, was suspended pending further investigation.

On June 25, 1957, a decision was rendered by the Bureau of Land Management's Alaska operations supervisor, canceling the entry; this decision was affirmed by the Office of the Director, Bureau of Land Management, on May 15, 1958, and the Bureau's decision, in turn, was affirmed by the Deputy Solicitor of the Department of the Interior on January 14, 1959 (Lewis Sanford Cass, A-27742).

S. 2530 would direct the Secretary of the Interior to reinstate Mr. Cass' canceled homestead entry, and to process it in accordance with the applicable provisions of law, subject to such modifications of time requirements as may be deemed equitable. Since the withdrawn lands here involved are not needed for any Federal purpose, we have no objection to their passage from Federal ownership. The lands are, in fact, already earmarked, by public land order 913, for disposition under one of the public land laws.

ADDITION OF LANDS TO THE NATIONAL FORESTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1588, House bill 9822.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 9822) to provide that lands within the exterior boundaries of a national forest acquired under section 8 of the act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U.S.C. 315g), may be added to the national forest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1628) explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

H.R. 9822 will grant national forest status to lands within the exterior boundaries of national forests acquired by the United States under the exchange provisions of the Taylor Grazing Act (43 U.S.C. 315g).

NEED

Section 8 of the act of June 28, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 1272; 49 Stat. 1976; 62 Stat. 533), authorizes the Secretary of the Interior, within certain limitations, to exchange public domain lands for privately owned lands of equal value. Under the

authority of this existing law some exchanges have been effected which have resulted in the acquisition of private lands within the boundaries of national forests. Although these lands within national forests should, logically, be administered in accordance with the laws governing national forest lands, there is no authority to accomplish this for many of the areas that have been acquired.

In the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, New Mexico, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming additions may not be made to national forests except by act of Congress (16 U.S.C. 471, 471a). Because of this restriction it has been necessary in the past for legislation to be enacted to give national forest status to privately owned lands acquired by the Department of the Interior through exchanges under the Taylor Grazing Act (see the act of Aug. 9, 1955, 69 Stat. 540).

The committee was advised that there are at this time 3,300 acres of land within national forest boundaries in several of the above-mentioned States that have been acquired by the Department of the Interior by exchanges under the Taylor Grazing Act but to which national forest status cannot attach without further legislation. The committee believes that these lands, which are intermingled with and generally similar in character to adjoining national forest lands, should be administered uniformly with the adjacent forest lands.

Enactment of H.R. 9822 will permit the Secretary of the Interior, upon a determination by the Secretary of Agriculture that the lands involved are suitable for administration as part of a national forest, to set apart and reserve, as part of the national forest involved, areas heretofore or hereafter acquired under the exchange provisions of the Taylor Grazing Act within the exterior boundaries of the forest. After the entry of a public land order, the lands would be subject to the laws, rules, and regulations applicable to other lands within the national forest that have been set apart and reserved from the public domain for national forest use.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE SOUTH BARROW GAS FIELD

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1589, Senate bill 2020.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2020) to amend part IV, subtitle C, of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to develop the South Barrow gasfield, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 7422 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(c) The Secretary of the Navy may under subsection (a) develop the South Barrow gas field, naval petroleum reserve numbered 4, to supply gas to installations of the Department of Defense and other agencies of the United States located at or near Point Barrow, Alaska, the native village of Barrow,

and other communities and installations at or near Point Barrow, Alaska."

SEC. 2. Section 7430(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Secretary of the Navy in administering the naval petroleum reserves under this chapter shall use, store, sell, or exchange for other petroleum or refined products, the oil and gas products, including royalty products, from lands in the naval petroleum reserves, including gas products from lands in the South Barrow gas field of naval petroleum reserve numbered 4, and lands outside petroleum reserve numbered 1 covered by joint, unit, or other cooperative plans, for the benefit of the United States."

SEC. 3. The Federal agency or agencies in control of any pipeline between gas wells in the South Barrow gas field and the town of Barrow may authorize purchasers of the gas or carriers of the gas to install connections to such pipeline.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1629) explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This bill would provide authority for (1) the Secretary of the Navy to furnish gas from South Barrow gasfield in Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4 to all the Government-owned facilities in the Point Barrow area, and (2) the Secretary of the Navy to sell gas from the South Barrow gasfield in Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4 to the native village of Barrow and other communities and installations at or near Point Barrow, Alaska.

EXPLANATION

The laws applicable to the naval petroleum reserves require that the reserves be used and operated for the protection, conservation, maintenance, and testing of the reserves. The reserves exist for the purpose of conserving oil in the ground and for its production in time of emergency.

Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4 consists of approximately 35,000 square miles on the Arctic slope of Alaska. During exploration of this reserve between 1944 and 1953, two gasfields and three oilfields were found. Only the South Barrow gasfield is in production at this time. The gas produced from this field is being furnished to all the Government-owned facilities in the Point Barrow area despite the absence of specific statutory authorization for this practice. One of the purposes of the bill is to provide authority for the obviously sensible practice of furnishing gas to the Government-owned facilities in the area.

The Navy anticipates that it will be desirable to drill an additional well in the South Barrow field to supply Government agencies alone. The existence of a requirement for natural gas by the civilian population in the native village of Barrow affords an opportunity for the Government to amortize the cost of drilling an additional well through sales of gas to the civilian population. The second purpose of the bill is to provide authority for such sale.

The native village of Barrow is chartered as a corporation under the Indian Reorganization Act, better known as the Wheeler-Howard Act, of 1934. The village corporation has in turn organized a business cooperative under the laws of Alaska. This cooperative

is engaged in miscellaneous business activities and has received loans from the Department of the Interior. The indication is that this cooperative will be willing to purchase the gas from the Navy, install a domestic distribution system, and act as distributor of the gas. A purely private vendor would be equally eligible to act as distributor.

A civilian market and requirement for the gas exists because of the extremely low temperatures in the area and the high cost of importing other types of fuel. The committee was informed that the civilian population of Barrow spends about one-fourth of its income for fuel.

EXTENSION OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950, AS AMENDED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3203) to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the first sentence of section 717(a) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended by striking out "June 30, 1962" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1964".

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

Last week, the Senate passed S. 3203, after amending it so that all it did was to give a 1-year extension to the present powers under the Defense Production Act. The amendments which had been proposed by the administration and the amendment which had been proposed by Senator JAVITS were not considered. Instead, a new bill, S. 3436, was introduced by me, which contained all the administration amendments and the Javits amendment. I advised the Senator from New York that I would hold hearings on this bill in the middle of July, and it is still my intention to do so.

The House has now passed S. 3203, after amending it to provide for a 2-year extension. Like the Senate, however, no substantive amendments are made in the House version of S. 3203.

It does not seem to me that there is any need to go to a conference to discuss with the House the question whether the Defense Production Act should be extended for 1 year or 2 years. In any event, we will have hearings on all the proposed amendments this summer, and, if need be, we can have more hearings next year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is my understanding that S. 3203, the extension of the Defense Production Act passed the Senate with a 1-year extension.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It went to the House, and the House passed a 2-year extension. Is that correct?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes; that is correct. No amendments were accepted in the House.

Mr. PROXMIRE. No amendments were accepted. The amendments of the Senator from New York and the administration amendments will be the sub-

ject of hearings by our committee. Is that correct?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes. The chairman stated that later this summer we would have hearings on all the amendments. The extension is a 2-year extension, as the administration requested. In the Senate we cut down the extension to 1 year, on the request of some members of the committee. The House insisted on a 2-year extension. We did not think the change was sufficiently material to make a conference necessary, so we asked the Senate to concur in the House provision, rather than to go to conference on it.

Mr. PROXMIER. I wish to make it clear in the RECORD that I was the member of the committee who insisted on a 1-year extension. I want to make it clear on the RECORD now that I oppose a 2-year extension, and I want to be recorded as voting against a 2-year extension. The reason I do so is that I feel that once again this year we have been hurried in consideration of the legislation as we were in 1960 because this is an election year. Under these circumstances the chairman understandably wants to take care of this as rapidly as possible, one of the reasons being that it is an election year. It would have been far better if we had made the extension for 1 year, so that it could be taken up again in 1963, 1965, and so forth. In that way we would have a better chance of taking care of the matter in more detail and with greater care, which we cannot do with a 2-year extension always confronting us and placing our consideration in an election year.

ASSUMES 3-YEAR WAR

Another reason why I felt we should have a 1-year extension is that the assumption on which the Defense Production Act is being operated is to completely ignore the possibility of a nuclear war. It is based entirely on the assumption of a 3-year all-out conventional war, which is as unrealistic and unlikely as any I can imagine.

In view of the fact that this is a matter of whether our resources will be adequate to meet an attack, I feel very strongly that we should insist on a report in the near future. This same point was raised by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] back in 1960. The agency said at that time that there would be a report in a year.

REPORT IS YEARS OVERDUE

This is 1962, and no report has been furnished. This year again they said they will have a report some time in the near future. I believe the only way we can effectively handle this matter is to have a 1-year extension and to insist, when they come with their request for a renewal, that we get a report. That is the reason why the Senator from Wisconsin has taken as strong a position as he can on getting not a 2-year extension but only a 1-year extension of the Defense Production Act.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia feels that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin is justified in the position he takes. We met in January and saw that there was a law which was going to expire on June 30. How-

ever, the administration did not send the bill to us until April 19. It contained a great many new matters, plus a 2-year extension. We eliminated everything except the extension, which we changed to a 1-year extension. That was at the request of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin. Rather than have a certain fight over the many amendments, we cut out everything but the 1-year extension. The House was insistent. Rather than get into a bitter argument over it, I had the clerk check as many of our committee members as possible, and I found that the majority of them are willing to go along with a 2-year extension. They had a rollcall vote in the House. Let us not forget that. They were not taking any chances on it. Does the Senator know how many were recorded on that rollcall vote?

Mr. PROXMIER. I understand that it was a unanimous vote.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Three hundred and twenty-seven voted "aye," and no one voted "nay." Does the Senator expect us to go to the conference and fight over that? We would not have much luck.

Mr. PROXMIER. I wish to say to my friend from Virginia that I doubt very much that many of the Members of the House were concerned about the issues that I am raising on the floor today. If they had been, I am pretty sure they would not have voted unanimously. However the position of the Senator from Wisconsin is clear on the record. Perhaps in 1964 we can try for a 3-year or a 1-year extension, so that it will not come up again in an election year, and in that way can give more consideration to it than we have in the past. I am particularly concerned in view of the fact that this agency is operating on the assumption that total nuclear war has no connection with the kind of demands that will be made on the country, and because their assumption is based on an all-out 3-year conventional war, a ridiculous assumption.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Our thinking now is that we had better win a nuclear war 3 days after its starts. That is what we are thinking of now.

COOPERATION WITH FIRST WORLD CONFERENCE ON NATIONAL PARKS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Hickey in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2164) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the First World Conference on National Parks, and for other purposes, which was, in line 8, strike out "\$50,000," and insert "\$30,000."

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the

House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11879) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MILLS, Mr. KING of California, Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois, Mr. MASON, and Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 69) authorizing the printing for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary of additional copies of its hearings on "Constitutional Rights of the Mentally Ill" and "Wire-tapping and Eavesdropping Legislation."

THE SUPREME COURT DECISION ON PRAYER IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF NEW YORK

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, my grandfather used to say: "The tendency of everything is to be more so." In 1954, the Supreme Court of the United States—a court for which, as a young lawyer in the early part of the current century, I had unbounded admiration—not only reversed all previous decisions of all Federal and State courts on the subject of the operation of segregated public schools, but, for purely psychological reasons, so interpreted the equal rights provision of the 14th amendment as to amend the Constitution by judicial fiat. In repeated decisions since, the highest court of our land has violated a fundamental principle of judicial procedure.

Three weeks ago the Supreme Court of Florida in upholding a Florida law which required the daily reading of a brief passage from the Bible in all public schools announced:

We think it necessary that, unless otherwise clearly commanded by the plain language of the statutes or the Constitution, the courts refrain from purely philosophical invasion of the Constitution or long established and accepted customs of the vast majority of the American people. The recurrent whittling away of the bedrock foundations of our society can be nothing short of destructive of free government. Every doubtful judicial withdrawal of the sovereignty of the States or the traditional freedoms of the people weakens the fabric of the Nation and the confidence of its citizens. If the Constitution be wrong it should be corrected by amendment and not judicial usurpation.

On yesterday, in deciding a very similar case, which involved the recitation of a short and simple prayer in a public school in New York State—Engel against Vitale—unless students at the request of parents were excused. The Supreme Court, with only one dissenting voice, held the New York law to be in violation of the provision in the first amendment to the Constitution relating to the separation of church and state. I applaud the dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Stewart, who among other things said:

With all respect, I think the Court has misapplied a great constitutional principle. I cannot see how an "official religion" is established by letting those who want to say a

prayer say it. On the contrary, I think that to deny the wish of these schoolchildren to join in reciting this prayer is to deny them the opportunity of sharing in the spiritual heritage of our Nation.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. I commend the distinguished and able Senator from Virginia on the speech he is making. He is one of the best qualified Members of the Senate to deliver a speech on this subject. He is in my judgment the most learned Biblical scholar in the Senate and is also one of this body's great historians. He knows not only the Scriptures but also the laws of our country, the origins of the Constitution, and the entire history and tradition of our Nation. I read the pertinent part of the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

I ask the distinguished Senator from Virginia if Congress has made any law respecting the establishment or exercise of religion.

Mr. ROBERTSON. It certainly has not.

Mr. TALMADGE. Has any Senator or any Member of the House of Representatives introduced any bill to attempt to have enacted a law respecting the establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof?

Mr. ROBERTSON. No, because that principle was so clearly and forcibly announced in Virginia and written into the constitution of every State that no one, since we have had our Government, has ever attempted to do it.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it not true that the only law that has been made on this subject was by the action of the Supreme Court yesterday when, for the first time in the history of our Republic, six of its Justices acted to prohibit the schoolchildren of the State of New York from opening their classes with a nondenominational prayer addressed to the Almighty Supreme Being?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Supreme Court has decided several cases in the past few years in favor of atheists and agnostics; however, this is the most extreme ruling it has made.

My grandfather said that the tendency of everything is to be more so. Once the Supreme Court started to write the law and amend the Constitution, it has reached this shocking state of prohibiting the recital of a simple prayer in a public school; not by an act of Congress, but under a State law of New York, which specifically exempted any student whose parents or guardian might ask that his child be excluded because he did not want him to say or hear the prayer.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. In the Senator's estimation, carrying the ruling of the Supreme Court to its logical conclusion, is it not possible that the practice of opening the Senate and House of Rep-

resentatives with prayer every day is in jeopardy?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Of course; the Chaplain is paid from the taxpayers' funds.

Mr. TOWER. Could this practice conceivably jeopardize the whole system of having chaplains in the armed services?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Unless we adopt a Senate joint resolution, which I hope we will, saying that having prayer, having grace, observing the birth of Christ at Christmastime are not violations of the Constitution, I do not know what the Supreme Court might ultimately say with respect to any religious activity whatever in government.

Before I conclude, I shall introduce, on behalf of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], a constitutional amendment. The Senator from Mississippi desires to change the Constitution. If the saying of a prayer cannot be done in any other way, then let us change the Constitution.

When the Supreme Court is so clearly wrong, I should like to see quick action by Congress, saying, "You are wrong. You have usurped your constitutional authority."

We cannot repeal this decision. Perhaps some subsequent Supreme Court will reconsider the action, but Congress cannot alter the matter except by proposing a constitutional amendment and by going on record as opposing any further extension of such doctrine.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it not true that the crier of the Supreme Court, from the days of Chief Justice John Marshall down to Chief Justice Warren, has opened the Court with the prayer:

God save the United States and this honorable Court.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Absolutely. The Court has done that from time immemorial.

Mr. TALMADGE. According to the interpretation of six of the present Justices, is not the Court acting unconstitutionally in opening its sessions in that manner?

Mr. ROBERTSON. It could not be construed in any other way. Perhaps some day the Supreme Court Justices will decide that they themselves are unqualified to sit on the Court because they had sworn on the Bible to support and uphold the Constitution. It was necessary, of course, for them to do that in order to be sworn in, after the Senate had confirmed their nominations. What they have decided, in effect, is, "We must exclude the Bible from our Government."

Mr. TALMADGE. Can the Senator from Virginia think of anything more outrageous than to say that the Supreme Court in effect has held its own practice unconstitutional?

Mr. ROBERTSON. They certainly have cast very serious doubt on everything they have done.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it not true that every President of the United States, from George Washington to John F. Kennedy, has taken an oath to Almighty God when he assumed the office of President of the United States?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Absolutely.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it not true that every U.S. Senator and Member of the House of Representatives, from the 1st Congress to the 87th Congress, has done the same thing?

Mr. ROBERTSON. We certainly have.

Mr. TALMADGE. I hold in my hand a 25-cent piece. I read the inscription on the coin, which was minted in 1961: "In God we trust."

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Supreme Court would say that is a political shibboleth and ought not to mean anything at all.

Mr. TALMADGE. Has not that been the motto of this country?

Mr. ROBERTSON. It has; and on the wall of the Chamber, under the clock, as can readily be seen by those on the other side of the gallery are the words, in large gold letters: "In God we trust."

But the Supreme Court would say that this is a superstition; that our Constitution prohibits such an assertion.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it not true that our national anthem, "The Star-Spangled Banner," contains a reference to our trust in God?

Mr. ROBERTSON. It surely does. One stanza contains the words:

And this be our motto: "In God is our trust."

Furthermore, when the "Star-Spangled Banner" is sung, we stand at attention. Possibly the Supreme Court would make that action illegal or require that the verse be omitted.

Mr. TALMADGE. Have not Presidents of the United States, both Democratic and Republican, sponsored a prayer breakfast each year in Washington, an event which is attended by the President, the Vice President, Members of Congress, members of the Cabinet, and other distinguished leaders of this country?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Absolutely.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it not the policy of our Government, and has it not been the policy since the founding of our Republic, to encourage the worship of God and the teaching of obedience to His laws?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Declaration of Independence contains the statement that we were created by God and have certain unalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That provision was placed in the Declaration of Independence before we even won our independence. The framers of the Declaration said that we had those rights and would not be denied them, because God had given them to us.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does the distinguished Senator from Virginia believe the Supreme Court decision yesterday aided the cause of atheism and harmed the cause of religion?

Mr. ROBERTSON. It certainly did not do the cause of religion any good.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does not the Senator also believe that the Supreme Court decision will have the effect of weakening the moral fiber of the youth of our country?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia thinks that the decision will have that effect, unless we who are responsible for the Government of the Nation stand up and declare the kind of government we are operating and the principles for which we stand.

Let us remember what Benjamin Franklin said in the Constitutional Convention, when that convention could not agree on the proportion of the representation to be had by the big States and the small States:

In this emergency, when we are groping in the dark, as it were, for political light, and scarce able to perceive it when presented to us, why has it not once occurred to us to ask the Father of Lights to illuminate our understanding?

I have lived for a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proof I see of the fact that God governs in the affairs of men. If it be true that no star can fall to the ground without His knowledge, how can we hope, sir, to see a new empire without His notice, without His aid?

That was the way our Government was started.

Mr. TALMADGE. Did the able Senator from Virginia note, as I did, that at the same time the Supreme Court attempted to prohibit the youth of our country from praying in the public schools, the Court also prohibited the Postmaster General from barring magazines circulated primarily among homosexuals from the mails?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator has heard it said, as have other Senators, that the Court would not prohibit the circulation of obscene literature among the youth of the country, but yet it would not allow them to join in the offering of a prayer when they go to school.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does not the Senator from Virginia think things in our Nation have come to a sorry pass when the Supreme Court of the United States would take two such actions on the same day?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Indeed so. Later, I shall read from a statement made by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], who said he was shocked. And the Senator from Georgia was shocked, and I was shocked; and I hope all Members of the Senate were shocked, and that they will not hesitate to say they were shocked, and will not hesitate to join with us in a resolution to say to the Court, "We will not stand for this any longer. You have gone as far in misinterpreting the Constitution and our form of government as we will stand for; and if you go further, you will do so at your peril."

Mr. TALMADGE. Does the Senator from Virginia recall that when some of our friends seek to espouse a certain cause, they argue how far behind Russia we are in working in that particular area? Did it strike the Senator's mind, as it did mine, that we are about 40 years behind Russia in prohibiting the youth of our country from praying?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Indeed so; and before I conclude my remarks I shall read from a decision by the Supreme Court of Florida, rendered on June 6, in which it said there are now, roughly speaking, two forms of government, democracy

and communism, and that the essence of a democracy is that we believe in God and have freedom of religion; those two distinguish us and others who call themselves democracies from the type of government which is called communism, which denies the existence of God and repudiates the Bible.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Virginia for his efforts in this regard. I pledge him my wholehearted support for this proposed constitutional amendment; and I hope this incident will shock the American people at long last into rising up in wrath and indignation and demanding that their elected representatives in the House of Representatives and in the Senate take some action to curb the Supreme Court and its rampant amending of the Constitution by judicial fiat.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I thank the Senator from Georgia; and, again, I wish to say that at the outset the Senator from Georgia paid me a tribute far beyond my just deserts, but in any event I knew it sprang from the heart of a true friend, and I appreciate it very much.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. Was it not the intent of the framers of the first amendment of the Constitution to permit freedom of religion in this country, but not freedom from religion?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Absolutely.

Mr. TOWER. But does not the Supreme Court's interpretation tend to narrowly proscribe the exercise of religion?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes, it tends to take away the freedom of religion. That is the point of this decision. But I shall quote George Washington's words in both his inaugural address and his Farewell Address in referring to this subject; he, of course, was one of those who helped frame the Constitution.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. I should like to ask the Senator from Virginia whether we would be far wrong in saying that in this decision the Supreme Court has held that God is unconstitutional, and for that reason the public schools must be segregated against Him?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, the Court would certainly take God out of the public schools; there is no doubt about that.

Mr. ERVIN. In recent days I have been much intrigued with the interpretation which the writer of this particular opinion—Justice Black—places upon the right of freedom of speech, as guaranteed by the first amendment to the Constitution. He says the right of freedom of speech is absolute and is not subject to any limitation whatever—which means that a person can call any woman, however virtuous, a prostitute; or any man, however honest, a thief; or any person, however patriotic, a traitor, without being called to account for it in

any court of the land. But does not that Justice place a limitation upon the absolute right of freedom of speech, by making it subject to the qualification that although everyone has a right to freedom of speech under all other circumstances and on all other occasions, it is now subject to a limitation that a person cannot talk to God or about God while he is on public-school property?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, one reaches that conclusion if he carries this decision to its ultimate effect.

Mr. Justice Black, in trying to justify his misguided opinion, referred to Madison and Jefferson. But, as I shall point out, Justice Black completely misinterpreted what they said in their fight for religious freedom.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield again to me?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. I should like to thank the distinguished Senator from Virginia. At our Wednesday morning prayer breakfasts, I have often been inspired by his great devotion to his God and by his very profound and inspirational remarks; and I should like to thank him for his remarks on the floor today. I associate myself with those remarks and proffer him my support.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I thank the Senator from Texas very much.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield again to me?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. I should like to ask the Senator from Virginia whether the records of the Constitutional Convention do not disclose the fact that at a time when it appeared that it would be most difficult, because of the differing views, to obtain a Constitution which would reconcile the varying views to such an extent that there could be a Constitution, the Constitutional Convention, at the suggestion of Benjamin Franklin, prayed to God for guidance and assistance?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is absolutely correct, and I have already referred to that fact. In fact, we probably would not have had a Constitution if they had not done that. It brought them together and gave them light—so much so, that Gladstone could say that the Constitution was the greatest instrument ever struck off by the hand and purpose of man.

Mr. ERVIN. Let me point out that in this Chamber, on the wall beneath the clock, there are inscribed in gold the words, "In God we trust."

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is true, and we thought those words signified the kind of government we have and the way we are attempting to legislate. But, as the Senator has said, this ruling of the Court would not permit anyone to say, in a school, "In God we trust."

Mr. ERVIN. But the Senate Chamber is also public property, as much so as the public schools, is it not?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. ERVIN. And this Chamber is likewise subject to the Constitution, as such, is it not?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. So, under this decision, how can we be permitted to allow the words "In God we trust" to remain on the wall of this Chamber?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, we have to decide whether to repudiate the words "In God we trust" or to repudiate the Court. It will not take me long to decide which choice to make.

Mr. President, I wish to refer to what Mr. Justice Stewart said in his dissenting opinion:

The Court's historical review of the quarrels over the Book of Common Prayer in England throws no light for me on the issue before us in this case. England had then and has now an established church. Equally unenlightening, I think, is the history of the early establishment and later rejection of an official church in our own States. For we deal here not with the establishment of a state church, which would of course, be constitutionally impermissible, but with whether schoolchildren who want to begin their day by joining in prayer must be prohibited from doing so.

Moreover, I think that the Court's task, in this as in all areas of constitutional adjudication, is not responsibly aided by the uncritical invocation of metaphors like the "wall of separation," a phrase nowhere to be found in the Constitution. What is relevant to the issue here is not the history of an established church in 16th century England or in 18th century America, but the history of the religious traditions of our people, reflected in countless practices of the institutions and officials of our Government.

At the opening of each day's session of this Court we stand, while one of our officials invokes the protection of God. Since the days of John Marshall our chief has said, "God save the United States and this honorable Court." Both the Senate and the House of Representatives open their daily sessions with prayer. Each of our Presidents, from George Washington to John F. Kennedy, has upon assuming his office asked the protection and help of God.

The Court today says that the State and Federal Governments are without constitutional power to prescribe any particular form of words to be recited by any group of the American people on any subject touching religion. The third stanza of "The Star-Spangled Banner" made our national anthem by act of Congress in 1931, contains these verses:

"Blest with victory and peace, may the heav'n rescued land
Praise the Pow'r that hath made and preserved us a nation.
Then conquer we must, when our cause it is just,
And this be our motto: 'In God is our trust.'"

In 1954, Congress added a phrase to the "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag," so that it now contains the words, "One Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all." In 1952, Congress enacted legislation calling upon the President each year to proclaim a National Day of Prayer. Since 1865, the words "In God we trust" have been impressed on our coins.

The minority views of Mr. Justice Stewart coincided with the unanimous decision of the State Supreme Court of Florida on June 6, to which I have referred. In that case an agnostic, a Jew, and a Unitarian in Miami sought to enjoin all religious activities in the Dade County public schools. They especially objected to a Florida statute that re-

quires the daily reading of a brief passage from the Bible, but they also wanted to put an end to the occasional singing of hymns in music classes, the painting of pictures on religious themes, the decoration of schoolrooms at Christmastime, the saying of grace or other prayers at school functions, and the holding of baccalaureate ceremonies at commencement. In brief, they wanted to wipe out every vestige of religious affirmation in the public school system, even though a Dade County regulation specifically excuses those children who do not wish to listen to the Bible verse or to participate in other activities of a religious nature.

The Court held:

We believe it necessary that public education give due recognition to the place of religion and the culture and convictions of our people but that in doing so the principle of separation of church and state must be safeguarded. The road is a difficult one but, certainly, we cannot agree that banishing the Bible and music and paintings of religious connotation will benefit the plaintiff's children in any material way. We are of the opinion that erasing the influence of the best literature, music, and art and gentler aspects of American life in general would be to create an antireligious attitude in the schools and substantially injure the well-being of the majority of the schoolchildren. And although it may be urged that to take such drastic action is to incur the good will of the nation's enemy we think the cost too great and the proposal ill founded in law.

We are sensible of the extent to which the sophistries of agnosticism have gained credence. And we acknowledge the trend toward the preference of minorities over the majority and toward the requiring of the majority, which seem never to suffer psychological trauma, to yield up its cherished customs and rights. Although we concede the duty to turn the other cheek to the enemy and to deal gently with the weak, we do not agree that it is our function to subvert the purpose and intent of the Constitution to those ends, nor do we feel impelled to indulge in flights of fanciful philosophy. When we subscribed to our official oaths it was with "no mental reservations and with no purpose to construe the Constitution by any hypercritical rules."

For all practical purposes there are now in the world just two forms of government, loosely denominated democracy and communism. The vital difference between the two is that the democracies accept religion and guarantee its free exercise, in one form or another, as part of the day-to-day lives of their people, whereas communism has banished religion, except as it may be bootlegged in the dark and inhospitable corners. A consequential distinction, as the major difference is applied to these United States, is that here we prohibit the governmental establishment of religion but guarantee to all the free exercise thereof while, under communism, religion is denied and those who profess religion are hounded underground.

We feel it equally imperative that we preserve the safeguards of the Constitution against all violations of the "establishment" and "free exercise" clauses and, at the same time, preserve those clauses and the rights of the States and the people thereunder against weasel-worded constructions and distinctions designed to impute to them either more or less than was originally intended.

In a futile attempt to justify his view, concurred in by a majority of the U.S. Supreme Court, that the reciting of a simple prayer was the establishment of a religion in violation of the Constitu-

tion, Mr. Justice Black referred to the fight that Thomas Jefferson and James Madison made in Virginia on that vital and fundamental principle of personal freedom. Unfortunately, however, he showed no familiarity with the history of that issue or with the real purpose James Madison had in mind when he helped Jefferson perfect his bill for religious freedom in Virginia and when he helped frame the first 10 amendments to our Constitution, known as the Bill of Rights, which provided for the separation of church and state. Both Jefferson and Madison believed in God; both believed in the Bible; both believed that the principles of democracy which they sponsored were based upon the teachings of the Bible, and while neither wanted to put government in religion, neither wanted to take religion out of government. But, when carried to its final analysis, that is what the decision of the Supreme Court on yesterday will mean, notwithstanding the warning of Evangelist Billy Graham, made during his remarkable Chicago crusade that closed last week:

This generation must face the fact that it is either back to the Bible or back to the jungle.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that there are a great many people in our country besides members of the Supreme Court who are not familiar with James Madison's views on religious freedom as I outlined it in a speech on the floor of the Senate on February 22, 1961, I ask unanimous consent to have reprinted in the RECORD at this point, what I said on that subject at that time.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MADISON'S CONTRIBUTION TO RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

(Remarks of Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, of Virginia, in the Senate of the United States, Wednesday, February 22, 1961)

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, by a singular coincidence in the same week in which we celebrate the anniversary of the birth of the chief architect of our independence, affectionately known as the Father of his Country, the Congress has received a proposal from the President of the United States, urging it to embark for the first time in our national history on a program of Federal aid to education. And involved in that program is one of the most unique and vital features of our Federal Constitution, namely, the separation of church and state.

President Kennedy, in recommending the appropriation of funds for public schools, has requested that parochial and other church schools at a certain level be excluded, but at the college level that they be included. That proposal will, of course, touch off a debate on the history and the meaning of the doctrine of the separation of church and state, and its application to the appropriation of public funds for church owned and operated schools and colleges.

On many occasions, I have expressed the view that the ability and wisdom of the representatives of 13 new States who assembled in Philadelphia in the summer of 1787 to draft a plan for a more perfect Union, have never been excelled in this or any other nation. If that be true, and I challenge any colleague to deny it, the views of the Founding Fathers on the principle of separation of church and state should be a lamp unto our feet.

Students of history well know that religious intolerance did not commence with the crucifixion of Christ and the persecution of his followers. Throughout recorded history organized government has sought to enforce its will in religious as well as temporal affairs. Many of the early colonists in this country, notably those who settled in Massachusetts, came in search of religious freedom. Those who made the first permanent English settlement at Jamestown in 1607 did not come for that purpose, but they did come imbued with the spirit of political freedom; they did organize the first representative government on this continent; and they were the first to realize that there could be no complete political freedom unless the Government was prohibited from interfering with the individual's religious views.

While George Washington was not as active as Thomas Jefferson and James Madison in behalf of legislation on the subject of religious freedom, he, a deeply religious man and always loyal to the established Church of England, endorsed as strongly as Jefferson and Madison the principle of separation of church and state. In a letter to the members of a new church in Baltimore, he wrote:

"We have abundant reason to rejoice that in this land the light of truth and reason has triumphed over the power of bigotry and superstition, and that every person may here worship God according to the dictates of his own heart. In this enlightened age and in this land of equal liberty it is our boast that a man's religious tenets will not forfeit the protection of the laws, nor deprive him of the right of attaining and holding the highest offices that are known in the United States."

Later, in an address sent to the General Committee of the United Baptist Churches in Virginia, with which my colonial ancestors were associated, and which had suffered perhaps more persecution at the hands of an intolerant government than any other denomination, General Washington wrote:

"If I could have entertained the slightest apprehension, that the Constitution made in the Convention, where I had the honor to preside, might possibly endanger the religious rights of any ecclesiastical society, certainly I would never have placed my signature to it; and if I could now conceive that the General Government might ever be so administered as to render the liberty of conscience insecure, I beg you will be persuaded, that no one would be more zealous than myself to establish effectual barriers against the horrors of spiritual tyranny, and every species of religious persecution. For you doubtless remember that I have often expressed my sentiments that every man, conducting himself as a good citizen, and being accountable to God alone for his religious opinions, ought to be protected in worshipping the Deity according to the dictates of his own conscience."

Again, in his justly famed Farewell Address, which was read to us this morning, Washington said:

"Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens."

Therefore, in discussing today the contribution made by another great Virginian to the cause of the type of freedom which we have enjoyed under a Constitution which provides for the separation of church and state, I wish to emphasize the point made by Washington that there is a difference between religion in government and government in religious affairs. I further emphasize the point that the current debate in connection with a school-aid program of the doctrine of separation of church and

state, will avail us little unless it includes the realistic premise that what this day and generation needs is not more Federal aid to the individual, but a more active support by the individual of religion and morality—"great pillars," as stated by Washington, "of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens."

Students of Virginia history will recall the provision for religious freedom that was included in George Mason's bill of rights, and incorporated in Virginia's first constitution, and a still broader provision in a bill offered in the Virginia Legislature by Patrick Henry. It remained, however, for the chief architect of the Philadelphia Constitution, James Madison, to outline the fundamental reasons for the doctrine of separation of church and state, which was subsequently incorporated in Jefferson's statute for religious freedom in Virginia and was written by Madison into the first amendment of the Federal Constitution. It was largely due to his efforts that Virginia was the first State in the modern world with both complete religious freedom and complete separation of church and state.

It was Madison at whose insistence the Virginia Bill of Rights of 1776 was so modified as to read:

"All men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion, according to the dictates of conscience."

Until Madison's amendment the document had provided that there be religious toleration. For this statesman, mere toleration was insufficient; he proclaimed that "the right of every man is liberty—not toleration."

Madison's primary contribution to the dual causes of religious freedom and the separation of church and state—and that which had the greatest repercussions—was his famous "Memorial and Remonstrance" of 1784 against a proposal of the Virginia House of Delegates to provide, through assessments, for teachers of the Christian religion.

It is important to consider the circumstances which led to Madison's "Remonstrance."

The decision on a general assessment for the support of religion in Virginia had been deferred, by article VI of the 1776 Preliminary Act for Religious Freedom to the determination of a future assembly.

In the house the assessment proposals were vigorously argued by no lesser advocate than Patrick Henry. It may seem paradoxical that the man who a few years before had been proclaimed the "firebrand of the American Revolution" and who in the near future was to denounce the Federal Constitution as a return to tyranny, would fail to appraise the implications of State-sponsored financial support of the Christian religion. Henry advanced as his chief argument the close relation of religion to the prosperity of the State, calling attention to the fate of nations which had neglected religion, and inferring the need of State support. Madison fully answered this contention by stating that the true question was not—Is religion necessary?—but—Are religious establishments; that is, State-supported establishments, necessary for religion?

In spite of Madison's logic and vigor the house adopted on November 11, 1784, the following resolution designed to carry out Henry's plan:

"That the people of this Commonwealth, according to their respective abilities, ought to pay a moderate tax or contribution annually, for the support of the Christian religion, or of some Christian church, denomination or communion of Christians, or of some form of Christian worship."

Nevertheless, Madison was able to postpone the third and final reading of the subsequent bill tailored to implement the resolution's intention. Only the determination and resourcefulness of Madison in his op-

position and the election of Henry to Virginia's governorship on November 17 prevented this assessment bill from becoming law in 1784.

Madison used to advantage the delay which his efforts had won. With the endorsement of Mason and Nicholas he prepared between sessions and circulated in June and July of 1785 the remarkable "Memorial and Remonstrance."

The epochmaking document, which I will quote in part, was divided into an introduction and 15 succeeding points:

"To the Honorable the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia:

"We, the subscribers, citizens of the said Commonwealth, having taken into serious consideration a bill printed by order of the last session of general assembly, entitled 'A bill establishing a provision for teachers of the Christian religion,' and conceiving that the same, if finally armed with the sanctions of a law, will be a dangerous abuse of power, are bound as faithful members of a free State to remonstrate against it, and to declare the reasons by which we are determined. We remonstrate against the said bill—

"1. Because we hold it for a fundamental and undeniable truth 'that religion, or the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence.' The religion, then, of every man must be left to the conviction and conscience of every man and it is the right of every man to exercise it as these may dictate. This right is in its nature an unalienable right.

"2. Because, if religion be exempt from the authority of the society at large, still less can it be subject to that of the legislative body.

"3. Because it is proper to take alarm at the first experiment on our liberties. * * * Who does not see that the same authority which can establish Christianity in exclusion of all other religions may establish, with the same ease, any particular sect of Christians in exclusion of all other sects? That the same authority which can force a citizen to contribute 3 pence only of his property for the support of any one establishment may force him to conform to any other establishment in all cases whatsoever?

"4. Because the bill violates that equality which ought to be the basis of every law, and which is more indispensable in proportion as the validity or expediency of any law is more liable to be impeached. If all men are by nature equally free and independent, all men are to be considered as entering into society on equal conditions; as relinquishing no more, and therefore retaining no less, one than another, of their natural rights. Above all, are they to be considered as retaining an equal title to the free exercise of religion according to the dictates of conscience.

"5. Because the bill implies either that the civil magistrate is a competent judge of religious truths or that he may employ religion as an engine of civil policy. The first is an arrogant pretension, falsified by the contradictory opinions of rulers in all ages and throughout the world; the second, an unhallowed perversion of the means of salvation.

"6. Because the establishment proposed by the bill is not requisite for the support of the Christian religion. To say that it is, is a contradiction to the Christian religion itself, for every page of it disavows a dependence on the powers of this world.

"7. Because experience witnesseth that ecclesiastical establishments, instead of maintaining the purity and efficacy of religion, have had a contrary operation. During almost 15 centuries has the legal establishment of Christianity been on trial. What have been its fruits? More or less, in all places, pride and indolence in the clergy; ignorance and servility in the laity; in both,

superstition, bigotry and persecution. Inquire of the teachers of Christianity for the ages in which it appeared in its greatest luster; those of every sect, point to the ages prior to its incorporation with civil policy.

"8. Because the establishment in question is not necessary for the support of civil government. If it be urged as necessary for the support of civil government only as it is a means of supporting religion, and it be not necessary for the latter purpose, it cannot be necessary for the former. If religion be not within the cognizance of civil government, how can its legal establishment be necessary to civil government? * * * Rulers who wished to subvert the public liberty, may have found an established clergy convenient auxiliaries. A just government, instituted to secure and perpetuate it, needs them not. Such a government will be best supported by protecting every citizen in the enjoyment of his religion with the same equal hand which protects his person and his property by neither invading the equal rights of any sect, nor suffering any sect to invade those of another.

"9. Because the proposed establishment is a departure from that generous policy which offering an asylum to the persecuted and oppressed of every nation and religion, promised a luster to our country, and an accession to the number of its citizens. What a melancholy mark is the bill of sudden degeneracy? Instead of holding forth an asylum to the persecuted, it is itself a signal of persecution. It degrades from the equal rank of citizens all those whose opinions in religion do not bend to those of the legislative authority.

"10. Because it will have a like tendency to banish our citizens. The allurements presented by other situations are every day thinning their number. To superadd a fresh motive to emigration by revoking the liberty which they now enjoy would be the same species of folly which has dishonored and depopulated flourishing kingdoms.

"11. Because it will destroy that moderation and harmony which the forbearance of our laws to intermeddle with religion has produced among its several sects. Torrents of blood have been spilt in the Old World in consequence of vain attempts of the secular arm to extinguish religious discord by proscribing all differences in religious opinion.

"12. Because policy of the bill is adverse to the diffusion of the light of Christianity. * * * Instead of leveling, as far as possible, every obstacle to the victorious progress of truth, the bill, with an ignoble and un-Christian timidity, would circumscribe it with a wall of defense against the encroachments of error.

"13. Because attempts to enforce by legal sanctions, acts obnoxious to so great a proportion of citizens tend to enervate the laws in general, and to slacken the bands of society.

"14. Because a measure of such singular magnitude and delicacy ought not to be imposed without the clearest evidence that it is called for by a majority of citizens and no satisfactory method is yet proposed by which the voice of the majority in this case may be determined, or its influence secured.

"15. Because, finally, the equal right of every citizen to the free exercise of his religion, according to the dictates of conscience, is held by the same tenure with all our other rights. If we recur to its origin, it is equally the gift of nature; if we weigh its importance, it cannot be less dear to us; if we consult the declaration of those rights which pertain to the good people of Virginia as the basis and foundation of government, it is enumerated with equal solemnity, or rather with studied emphasis.

"We, the subscribers, say that the general assembly of this Commonwealth have no such authority. And in order that no effort

may be omitted on our part against so dangerous an usurpation, we oppose to it this remonstrance earnestly praying, as we are in duty bound, that the Supreme Lawgiver of the Universe, by illuminating those to whom it is addressed, may, on the one hand, turn their councils from every act which would affront His holy prerogative or violate the trust committed to them; and, on the other, guide them into every measure which may be worthy of His blessing, redound to their own praise, and establish more firmly the liberties, the prosperity, and the happiness of the Commonwealth."

The influence of this document was widespread not only in Virginia but throughout the other Colonies.

A letter of Madison's describes the profound local effect. He writes that the "remonstrance" met with "the approbation of the Baptists, the Presbyterians, the Quakers, and a few Roman Catholics, universally; of the Methodists in part; and even not a few of the sect; that is, the Anglicans—his own religion incidentally, formerly established by law." The Presbyterians adopted a strong memorial against the assessment bill specifically referring to the fact that it would be unfair to the Jews, as it provided for only one religion, Christianity. The general association of Virginia Baptists was even more extreme in its denunciation of Henry's proposals.

It can be said without exaggeration that Madison's Remonstrance so stimulated the Virginia electorate that not only did the assembly reject the assessment bill in the session of 1785 but it moved to adopt by a margin of 67 to 20 the bill establishing religious freedom, which had been prepared by Thomas Jefferson and introduced into the Virginia Assembly as early as June 13, 1779.

The ferment overflowed Virginia's boundaries and helped stifle attempts in other Colonies to siphon public funds into the regular support of the churches.

Madison overlooked few opportunities to advance the principles of his Remonstrance.

His first amendment to the Constitution reads in part:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Madison wished to go further and proposed an amendment which would protect the principles of religious freedom and separation of church and state not only from Federal encroachment but also from State intervention. That failed to win acceptance, but it illustrates the extraordinary vision of this statesman. His proposal had anticipated by 134 years the Supreme Court's application of the 14th amendment in *Meyer* against Nebraska (1923) to freedom of religion.

The religious minorities had no greater friend than James Madison. In his youth he heard with deep compassion the sermon of a Baptist minister from the only pulpit legally available to him—the window of a jail.

In his old age, after retirement from the Presidency, he received a letter containing the following tribute from a member of the Jewish faith in New York:

"I ought not to conceal from you that it affords me sincere pleasure to have an opportunity of saying that to your efforts and those of your illustrious colleagues in the convention the Jews in the United States owe many of the blessings which they now enjoy, and the benefit of this liberal and just example has been felt very generally abroad and has created a sincere attachment toward this country on the part of foreign Jews."

Madison's influence on our Nation's progress toward freedom of religion and its corollary, separation of church and state, was both extensive and enlightened. He is unexcelled among our forefathers for logi-

cal and consistent development of the constitutional ideal of religious freedom.

In conclusion, I wish to quote again from the immortal George Washington, who, in his first inaugural address, said:

"It would be peculiarly improper to omit in this first official act my fervent supplications to that Almighty Being who rules over the universe, who presides in the councils of nations, and whose providential aids can supply every human defect, that His benediction may consecrate to the liberties and happiness of the people of the United States a Government instituted by themselves for these essential purposes, and may enable every instrument employed in its administration to execute with success the functions allotted to his charge."

The debate of the issue of Federal aid to church schools can be a vital and dynamic contribution to the President's New Frontier program, if it challenges the willingness of our people to prove by their personal conduct that the motto on our coins, "In God We Trust," is something more than a political shibboleth.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "And Forbid Them Not," published in the Washington Evening Star of June 26, 1962, relating to the decision of the Supreme Court relative to prayer in the public schools of New York.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Evening Star (Washington, D.C.), June 26, 1962]

"AND FORBID THEM NOT"

Jesus, according to St. Luke, remonstrated with his disciples and said: "Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not." Little children may not approach Him, however, through the public schools of New York. Six Justices of the Supreme Court have forbidden it.

At issue was this brief nondenominational prayer: "Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence on Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers, and our country." This prayer had been composed by the State board of regents and was recited each morning in at least some of the schools.

Had any child been required to recite the prayer, the Court would have had every reason to forbid it. But this was not the case. Those who did not wish to participate were not even required to be present when the prayer was recited. Thus, the real effect of the Court's ruling is to prohibit children who might wish to do so from reciting the prayer. And this in the name of freedom of religion.

The first amendment says that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, the founders having in mind the established Church of England and similar early efforts in some of the colonies. But would the recital of this simple prayer, as recommended by a State agency, be equivalent to enacting a law respecting an establishment of religion? Of course not, and Justice Black, speaking for the majority, was obliged to concede that it does not amount to a "total establishment of one particular religious sect to the exclusion of all others." In our opinion it does not remotely approach this. Nor does it bear any rational relationship to the religious struggles of 200 or 300 years ago.

In his dissent, Justice Potter Stewart noted that the Supreme Court begins each day by invoking the protection of God. Its crier importunes: "God save the United States and this honorable Court." How long will this be tolerated? And what about the prayers

which are said each day in the House and the Senate. Does this contravene the first amendment?

Justice Stewart also noted that "The Star-Spangled Banner" was declared to be our national anthem by an act of Congress in 1931. Yet its third stanza reads:

"Blest with victory and peace, may the heav'n rescued land
Praise the Pow'r that hath made and preserved us a nation!
Then conquer we must, when our cause it is just,
And this be our motto 'In God Is Our Trust.'"

Perhaps this could be substituted in New York for the proscribed prayer. But, on second thought, maybe it would be better not to suggest it. The Supreme Court some day might rule that Congress, in its act of 1931, passed a law respecting an establishment of religion, and that the national anthem, therefore, is unconstitutional. Farfetched? We are not so sure.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, we all regret the untimely death of our friend and distinguished colleague from South Dakota, Mr. Case. His earthly remains were carried to their final resting place today, accompanied by a number of our colleagues, including our friend from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. The Senator from Mississippi was deeply upset, as a number of us were, by the Supreme Court decision; and before he left Washington he prepared a memorandum which he asked that I present for him to the Senate. In that memorandum, he said:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR STENNIS

I have the conviction that people all over the country who rejoice in the spiritual heritage of this Nation were shocked, as I was, to learn that the Supreme Court has held that the permissive daily recital of a simple nondenominational prayer by public-school children breached the constitutional wall of separation of church and state. The prayer thus condemned by our highest Court did nothing more than acknowledge the pupils' dependence upon an Almighty God and ask His blessings upon them, their parents, their teachers, and their country. Only those who desired to do so joined in the recitation of this prayer; no compulsion was involved.

It is not my purpose or intent at this time to challenge point by point the rationale of the majority opinion in this case. However, I could hardly believe my eyes when I read that the Court had held that the prayer, even though admittedly nondenominational, and even though participation in it was admittedly voluntary, violated the first amendment, which merely prohibits the Congress from passing a law "respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

With all respect, I think the Court has utterly misconceived a great constitutional principle. I, for one, cannot comprehend how a religion is established by permitting schoolchildren who wish to do so to say a simple prayer. It is my belief that by this decision the Court has twisted freedom of religion into a quarantine against religion.

I submit that it offends both reason and logic to contend that the now outlawed prayer in any manner resulted in the establishment of any religion. The prayer is nonsectarian and nondenominational. The opinion of the Court concedes that participation in it is without compulsion. Under these circumstances few will believe that any real question of the church dominating the state is involved, and I have always been of the opinion that this was the basis of the constitutional provisions upon the subject.

If there was any question of sectarianism involved, or any issue of favoring one religious group over another, the situation, of course, would be entirely different. All we have here, however, was a conscientious effort to permit children who wished to do so to say that they believed in an Almighty God and to call forth His blessings. The Court has denied this right and the implications of its decision are enormous.

This, of course, is not the first time that the Court has departed so far from established constitutional concepts. There is a remedy, however, for the American people. It is by the process of a constitutional amendment, and I am today introducing an amendment designed to right the wrong which the Court has perpetrated. I realize, of course, that this is a delicate subject and one which needs and deserves careful study. However, I am convinced that, if necessary, my amendment can be perfected so that our constitutional guaranty of freedom of religion will be retained but will not in the future be allowed to become an instrument for the suppression of religion.

The voice of the people is already welling up in all of the corners of this Nation in protest against this decision, and I predict that the necessary amendment will be adopted by the Congress and ratified by the States quickly and decisively. The voice of those who believe in the spiritual heritage of this Nation and in the existence of a Supreme Being will be heard in an ever-swelling chorus.

Perhaps as never before in history we need today the comfort and support of moral and spiritual values. We here in the Senate do not deny ourselves the edifying effect of the eloquent prayers of our Chaplain. They give us faith and strength for our daily tasks. The children of our public schools, on a permissive basis, should not be denied the same privilege which we have established for ourselves. We should act promptly to fill the void in the spiritual life of our children which will exist by reason of the Court's decision.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a Senate joint resolution prepared by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit the use of prayer in public schools.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOINT RESOLUTION PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES TO PERMIT THE USE OF PRAYER IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. No provision of this Constitution or any article of amendment thereto shall be construed to prohibit nondenominational religious observance through the invocation of the blessing of God or the recitation of prayer, as a part of the activities of any school or other educational institution supported in whole or in part from public revenues, if participation therein is not made compulsory.

"SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legis-

latures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], I introduce the joint resolution which I send to the desk and ask to have appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 204) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit the use of prayer in public schools, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON (for Mr. STENNIS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY HIS EXCELLENCY DR. GUILLERMO LEON VALENCIA, PRESIDENT-ELECT OF THE REPUBLIC OF COLOMBIA

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, we are honored today by the presence of the distinguished President-elect of our neighbor republic to the South, Colombia, His Excellency Dr. Guillermo Leon Valencia.

It has been our pleasure to have His Excellency before some of the members of the Latin American Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations during lunch. We have had quite an interesting discussion with him.

At this time, Mr. President, I wish to present to the Senate His Excellency Dr. Guillermo Leon Valencia, the President-elect of the Republic of Colombia. We are delighted to have him with us.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I join the Senator from Alabama in extending greetings to the President-elect of the Republic of Colombia, Dr. Valencia, and also to Ambassador Carlos Sanz de Santamaria, who is in the Chamber with us at this time.

Colombia, as we all know, is one of the countries with which we are most closely associated with one with which our future is closely bound. It is perhaps unfortunate that His Excellency the President-elect and the Ambassador are visitors to the Senate today, when there is little opportunity to show them the United States Senate in action, but at least those of us who are now present extend to them our heartfelt greetings and express the hope that it will not be long before we shall have an opportunity to greet them again.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I join with my colleagues, the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Vermont, in the expression of welcome and what we hope will be the extension of the finest hospitality to this distinguished gentleman, the President-elect of the Republic of Colombia. Some of us have been privileged to have a personal visit with President-elect Valencia. We have found him to be an extremely able, dedicated public servant who is fully cognizant of the many problems facing our two countries and, indeed, the entire world. It is very gratifying to know that the citizens of the great Republic of

Colombia have seen fit to elect as President a man who is dedicated to the institutions of democracy and of political freedom.

Mr. President, we are sorry to know that the wife of the President-elect at present is in one of our great medical hospitals, Johns Hopkins. We express to this distinguished lady the good wishes of the people of the United States and of the U.S. Senate for her complete and early recovery and for all good health in the future. I am sure I speak for every Member of this body when I express these sentiments.

Mr. President, so that our colleagues may be informed, I ask unanimous consent that the press release by the Department of State relating to the visit to the United States by the President-elect of Colombia may be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA OF THE PRESIDENT-ELECT OF COLOMBIA, JUNE 1962

His Excellency Dr. Guillermo Leon Valencia, President-elect of the Republic of Colombia, will visit the United States beginning June 20. He and Mrs. Valencia have come to the United States for medical treatment at Johns Hopkins Hospital in Baltimore, Md. Mrs. Valencia will enter the hospital on June 21 and President-elect Valencia will do so on June 27 after an informal visit to Washington for discussions with Government officials.

President-elect Valencia will arrive in New York City on June 20. On June 21 he will accompany Mrs. Valencia to Johns Hopkins Hospital in Baltimore and then return to New York City. The President-elect will arrive in Washington on June 23.

During his stay in Washington President-elect Valencia will see President Kennedy, congressional leaders, and other Government officials. On June 25 he will lay a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, attend a luncheon in his honor given by President Kennedy at the White House, and a reception given by Acting Secretary of State George W. Ball at Blair House.

He will return to Baltimore for medical treatment on June 27.

President-elect Valencia was born in Popayan, Colombia, on April 27, 1909. He studied law at the University of Cauca and, with his father, founded the newspaper Claridad in Popayan in 1933. The President-elect served in the national house of representatives, in the national senate, and as Ambassador to Spain prior to his election as President on May 6, 1962.

He and Mrs. Valencia have two sons and two daughters.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate may stand in recess for 5 minutes, so that Senators may express their greetings to the President-elect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Thereupon, (at 2 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement.

The Senate being in recess,

His Excellency, Dr. Guillermo Leon Valencia, President-elect of the Republic of Colombia, accompanied by Amba-

sador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary Dr. Carlos Sanz de Santamaria, was escorted to the well of the Senate, where he was greeted by the Members of the Senate, after which he and the Ambassador retired from the Chamber.

Thereupon, (at 2 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.) the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. Moss in the chair).

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR REGULATION OF EXPORTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3161) to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 12 of the Export Control Act of 1949 is amended by striking out "June 30, 1962" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1965".

Sec. 2. Section 1(b) of the Export Control Act of 1949 is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The unrestricted export of materials without regard to their potential military and economic significance may adversely affect the national security of the United States."

Sec. 3. Section 2 of the Export Control Act of 1949 is amended by inserting "of the United States" immediately before the period at the end thereof.

Sec. 4. Section 3(a) of the Export Control Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Such rules and regulations shall provide for denial of any request or application for authority to export articles, materials, or supplies, including technical data, from the United States, its territories and possessions, to any nation or combination of nations threatening the national security of the United States, unless the President shall determine that such export does not make a significant contribution to the military or economic potential of such nation or nations which could prove detrimental to the national security and welfare of the United States."

Sec. 5. Section 5 of the Export Control Act of 1949 is amended by striking out "one year" and inserting in lieu thereof "two years".

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments made by the House, and I move that the Senate ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill and that the conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. CAPEHART, and Mr. BENNETT conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

WHITE HOUSE MANIPULATION OF NEWS MEDIA

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article which appeared in the New York Times for May 9 written by its noted columnist, James Reston, appear in the Record following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Reston, who can hardly be regarded as unfriendly to the Kennedy administration, calls attention to what I believe is one of the serious dangers to our form of government, caused by domination of all forms of the news media by President Kennedy. As Mr. Reston points out, this is a result not only of the importance of the Presidency in our form of government but more importantly because of the conscious policy adopted by the Kennedy administration to dominate the news.

The dangerous results of the Kennedy manipulation of the news media has again been dramatically illustrated in the handling of the President's all-out political speech in support of his medicare program delivered at Madison Square Garden. This purely political speech was carried free by all the major networks, while the doctors were compelled to pay for their reply.

Mr. Reston concludes his discussion of the political propaganda tactics of the Kennedy administration by citing the great danger which this poses:

As this trend continues, the dangers are obvious. The opposition can continue to express its feelings on the floor of the Congress, probably in the presence of a handful of Members and spectators, but the President has an audience of millions at his command any day he likes. It is not a situation that promises to maintain a political balance of power in the United States.

Since Mr. Reston wrote his article, the White House has gone to still further lengths to control and manipulate the news. The New York Herald Tribune was completely banned from the White House when the President canceled the famous 22 subscriptions. This was done because the White House did not approve of the manner in which the Herald Tribune presented the news to its readers. Certainly the President has the right to read or not to read any paper he may wish, but it is shocking that he would completely ban the newspaper from the White House, and thereby prevent even members of his staff from reading it. What is yet more shocking is that the White House would deliberately publicize the fact that it had canceled the Herald Tribune subscriptions. Quite obviously, this was intended to be a warning to other newspapers that they had better present the news in a manner acceptable to the President, or they too would be publicly censured.

This episode even moves so liberal a columnist as Robert Spivack to object to the petty petulance displayed by the White House, and I ask unanimous consent that his article appear in the Record following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. BENNETT. As if these events were not enough, the White House shorthand expert, Jack Romagna, who has transcribed Presidential statements and press conferences for over 20 years, was unceremoniously fired. Judging from newspaper accounts, he was thrown out because he dared to caption a Presidential statement made by telephone to a national convention of mayors in Florida, as emanating from the White House swimming pool.

I agree with Mr. Reston that the present White House policy of not only managing, but also manipulating and dominating the news, poses a serious threat to our republic. The goal of the Kennedy administration to dominate all forms of news media to the near exclusion of the administration's critics, establishes a dangerous precedent which in the hands of a President with totalitarian ambitions could be disastrous.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times, May 9, 1962]
HOW TO OVERBALANCE THE POLITICAL SCALES
(By James Reston)

LOS ANGELES, May 8.—The increasing power of nationwide mass communications is obviously working to the political advantage of the Kennedy's.

Not only is the President dominating the political news on national television, but his only competition in the national magazines seems to be his wife, Jacqueline.

The big, colorful magazine racks in the streets of Los Angeles today illustrate the point, Harper's magazine proclaims from its front cover "The Kennedy's Move In on Dixie." The cover on McCall's carries a picture of Mrs. Kennedy and her two children, and The Saturday Evening Post advertises "A Feminine Chat With Jackie." In fact Mrs. Kennedy's only competition at the moment seems to come from Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York on the cover of Newsweek, and from Nikolai Lenin, of all people, on the cover of Look.

On top of all this, the advent of a nationally circulated daily and weekly press is clearly adding to this trend. The Wall Street Journal is already publishing 5 days a week on the Pacific coast and circulating the National Observer on Sunday. The New York Times will start publishing 6 days a week in Los Angeles in the autumn, and this is already having a visible effect on the Pacific coast daily press.

They are increasing their coverage of national and international news. They are adding more nationally syndicated columns, most of them originating in Washington, and all this gives the President an even wider audience than he had before.

KENNEDY'S TECHNIQUES

This is something new in American political life. Franklin Roosevelt had national radio and the will and ability to use it effectively. But he didn't have television. Harry Truman and Dwight D. Eisenhower had both radio and television but used them sparingly and kept the Washington press corps in formal channels.

President Kennedy, however, is exploiting all the new mass communications. He had

an audience of 85,000 for a speech at the University of California the other day. Over 200,000 turned out to see him in New Orleans last week. He was all over the TV screens from Atlantic City today. Tomorrow his press conference will be televised nationally, and after that it will be a big Presidential rally in Madison Square Garden, with many of the stars of Hollywood and the New York theater as his supporting cast.

This conscious policy of dominating the news is apparent enough in Washington, but it is even more striking out here—especially in the absence of a popular national figure in the political opposition.

Former President Eisenhower has receded into the well-earned and agreeable shadows of retirement. Governor Rockefeller is still a remote regional figure at this distance, and even former Vice President Richard M. Nixon, showing off his new house to the press here last night, seemed less of a national figure than he did when he came to within 100,000 votes of the Presidency a little over a year ago.

This is a serious problem for the Republican party. It is being overwhelmed in the field of publicity, which is the battleground of presidential politics. The Democrats have passed power from the men born in the 19th century to the new generation born in the 20th, and the GOP has not. Also, the Republicans have to deal not only with an articulate young President in the White House but with the whole Kennedy clan.

Not since the days of Teddy Roosevelt and his "Princess Alice" has there been anything like it, and the Teddy Roosevelts didn't have instant communication with the whole continent. But now the Kennedys are getting more publicity than the Prime Minister and the Queen of England combined.

Some of this publicity is of course adverse, particularly in the national business and financial papers, and especially since the steel price controversy. But the mass circulation magazines are treating the Kennedys like a royal family and overwhelming the voice of the smaller critical journals.

THE NEWSMAKER

It is true, of course, that the President has usually dominated the news in all generations. What he says and does command the front pages, even if he does not open the White House and its staff to the press and TV reporters, but there is a new dimension now.

As the daily newspaper goes national, many of the large city newspapers that used to concentrate on local news have to move into the world to meet their competition. And Kennedy, being an astute politician, is exploiting the trend as much as he can.

As this trend continues, the dangers are obvious. The opposition can continue to express its feelings on the floor of the Congress, probably in the presence of a handful of members and spectators, but the President has an audience of millions at his command any day he likes. It is not a situation that promises to maintain a political balance of power in the United States.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the New York Herald Tribune, June 10, 1962]

LIBERAL'S VIEW: CREEPING CENSORSHIP (By Robert G. Spivack)

(Robert G. Spivack's column appears every Sunday in the Herald Tribune Forum section. He is a liberal who agrees, in general, with the objectives and programs of the Kennedy administration. In this extra column, Mr. Spivack raises sharp, challenging questions—about the President's relations with the press and the press' handling of the President.)

WASHINGTON.—A large segment of the Washington press corps is disappointed, even

angry, with President Kennedy. But you would never guess this if you watched his most recent televised news conference.

Superficially everything seemed harmonious. The President looked tense and tired to many newsmen in the room with him. But on television he looked healthy and happy.

How much the televised press conference affects public opinion is difficult to measure, but in terms of accuracy, it has become a gay deceiver. There are many ways in which the televised news conference gives a distorted picture of what is really taking place in Washington.

For this, a large share of the responsibility goes to the White House staff who seem to view the news conference as a stage production; even the questions on occasion seem to have been planted among a select handful. Newsmen, too, must accept a share of responsibility for the decline of the press conference.

They should be protesting the surroundings in which it is held. Certainly their questions should be phrased more sharply and self-discipline should make them avoid trivia.

WHY THE DISMAY?

What is the basis for the widespread dismay in the press corps? Two recent events have brought it to the surface, although any number of incidents have helped to build up resentment. Specifically:

The summary firing of competent Jack Romagna as chief White House stenographer, after 21 years of faithful service to Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower seemed a brutal action.

The President's decision to cancel not only his own subscription to the New York Herald Tribune, but 21 other subscriptions, could only leave the impression that he is now deciding the reading habits of his associates.

There is a joke making the rounds in Washington these days. "President Kennedy," it goes, "firmly believes in the right to dissent. In fact, he will tell you what you can dissent about."

In a way that tells the story of the administration and its use of the press. It also helps explain some of the deterioration in relations. Another cause is that some members of the press corps who have allowed themselves to be used are now beginning to have second thoughts about their relations with the administration.

The newspaperman, whether a columnist, a correspondent, or a stringer in some remote outpost, must retain his independence, his dignity, and sense of worth. If a politician favors a reporter with a beat it is natural enough to feel gratified. But simply because a man leaks a story, for whatever motives, does not automatically endow him with angelic qualities or make him the fountainhead of all wisdom.

Unfortunately, when a President honors some reporters with his presence, or with a story, they fall all over themselves. They even assume their assignment is henceforth to defend the man's every action and to protect him from hostile questioners.

This leads, as it has in the Kennedy administration, to an unhealthy relationship. Thus many newspapermen, who know better, did not protest the midnight calls from G-men to reporters who were covering a phase of the big steel story.

The President compounded that blunder by trying twice to laugh it off.

OTHER DEFICIENCIES

The President's press conference is deficient in other respects. Unlike President Eisenhower, who stood on the same floor level with the newspapermen, President Kennedy insists on being elevated on a rostrum. The questioner must thus look up to him and he looks down at the newsmen.

The auditorium in which the conference is held is cavernous, more like a large theater

than a room in which one might engage in give-and-take with the Chief Executive as in the Truman and Roosevelt days.

At his latest news conference the President used 10 precious minutes reading a statement that could have been mimeographed and handed out at the White House.

Although there were heated discussions by newsmen in the outer hall about the Romagna and Herald Tribune episodes when they came into the conference auditorium not one of the regulars asked a question about either. Whether it was the presence of the cameras, or the experience of previous complaints from the White House, or the grim look on Mr. Kennedy's face, they blew the big stories.

A solution, perhaps, to this creeping censorship would be that the press corps request an end to the televised press conferences under the present circumstances. The omnipresence of the cameras, among other things, seems to be inhibiting the newsmen. This is no service to the public, or the press, or, I suspect, in the long run to Mr. Kennedy himself.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE LATE SENATOR CASE, OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I want to express my deep sense of loss at the passing of our colleague, Senator Francis Case, of South Dakota. We had known one another since I first entered the Congress in 1947, when he also was a Member of the House, and our wives and families are good and warm friends.

Senator Case was one of the most competent Members of this great body. He was highly regarded by us all for his skill and his diligence. He was an honest, courageous, and dedicated public servant in the truest sense of those words. He never shrank from a fight on behalf of his high principles and firm convictions, and he never allowed partisanship to obscure his sense of fairness and propriety.

Those of us from Western States will always be indebted to Senator Case for his leadership in matters concerning development of natural resources in our region. He contributed much to the Nation with his work on weather modification research, desalination of water, highway problems, synthetic liquid fuels, including development of oil from shale, and similar matters which are of great concern to our region.

But the Nation as a whole always occupied first place in his thinking, and this was reflected in his outstanding work as a member of the Armed Services and Public Works Committees.

He was indeed a U.S. Senator from South Dakota in the full meaning of those words. He represented both his State and the Nation, and he did a fine, workmanlike job on behalf of both. We will miss him.

On behalf of Mrs. Carroll and our daughter, I wish to express our deepest, heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Case and her family in this time of bereavement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I join with the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado in the expression of sympathy and condolences to Mrs. Case, her daughter, and other members of the family of our late beloved colleague, Senator Francis Case, of South Dakota. South Dakota is my native State, and it has surely been ably represented in the U.S. Senate.

Senator Case stood as a symbol of personal and political integrity. His record is one of great courage and dedication to the public interest. We shall miss this fine public servant, as will the people of his State.

I am most pleased to be able to associate myself today with the generous, yet factual and true remarks of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, like the able Senator from Minnesota, I am glad to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Colorado. I hope that fitting recognition will be made of the many worthwhile contributions he made to the public welfare both on the committees of which he was a member and in the Senate itself.

For example, Francis Case was a leader in the study of the production of artificial rainfall. Also, his work in the field of desalination of water was extremely important. One of the first two plants established in connection with the brackish water development is located in his State of South Dakota and stands as a tribute to the work of Senator Case in that situation.

Having attended college with him and having known him for a long time, I regarded him as one of the finest men ever to serve in this body.

I am glad the Senator from Colorado has made the statement he has made today, in which he was joined by the able Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from New Mexico for their kind remarks. I feel certain that the family of Senator Case will be pleased to know that on this day, when the funeral is taking place in South Dakota, we who would have liked to attend, but could not because of circumstances beyond our control, desired to make these few remarks to the family during their time of sorrow.

AMENDMENT AND EXTENSION OF SUGAR ACT OF 1948

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1591, H.R. 12154, the amendment and extension of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, which has now been reported, and that it be made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H.R. 12154) to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 26, 1962, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 860. An act to provide greater protection against the introduction and dissemination of diseases of livestock and poultry, and for other purposes;

S. 1834. An act to further amend the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 896), as amended, by providing for an increase in the authorization funds to be granted for the construction of hospital facilities in the District of Columbia; by extending the time in which grants may be made; and for other purposes;

S. 3063. An act to incorporate the Metropolitan Police Relief Association of the District of Columbia;

S. 3266. An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to create a Library of Congress Trust Fund Board, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1925, as amended (2 U.S.C. 158), relating to deposits with the Treasurer of the United States of gifts and bequests to the Library of Congress and to raise the statutory limitation provided for in that section;

S. 3291. An act to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury;

S. 3350. An act to amend the act of August 7, 1946, relating to the District of Columbia hospital center to extend the time during which appropriations may be made for the purposes of that act; and

S.J. Res. 192. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there being no further business to come before the Senate today, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 27, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 26, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Job 22: 21: *Acquaint now thyself with Him and be at peace; thereby good shall come unto thee.*

O Thou who art the help and hope of all who come unto Thee with their trials and tribulations, their sorrows and sins, may we offer our noonday prayer in faith and humility, in simplicity and sincerity.